		2
1	I	N D E X
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	Tracy Smetana	5
4	Barry Simonson	18
5	Larry Hartman	22
6	Mark Herwig	34
7	Daniel Reed	37
8	Betsy Dugan	40
9	Larry Weber	44
10	Caroline Johnson	46
11	John Sanford Dugan	48
12	John Fisher-Merritt	51
13	Barry Simonson	54
14	Tim Anderson	54
15	Mary Anderson	58
16	Brenda Schillo	61
17	Mark Curwin	62
18	Jane Fisher-Merritt	63
19	Margaret Schulstrom	66
20	Steve Schulstrom	69
21	Kevin Walli	69
22	Mark Curwin	69
23	Kevin Walli	70
24	Mark Curwin	71
25	Larry Hartman	72

		3
1	Larry Hartman	76
2	Loretta Cartner	76
3	Larry Hartman	81
4	Rodney Porter	85
5	Barry Simonson	85
6	Mark Curwin	88
7	Russell Pollak	89
8	Katy Collier	92
9	John McKay	93
10	Ryan Swanson	95
11	Anne Dugan	97
12	Sandy Sterle	102
13	Gary Peterson	106
14	Craig Sterle	108
15	Janaki Fisher-Merritt	111
16	Kristie Laveau	116
17	Karola Dalen	118
18	Don O'Connor	120
19	Randy Hanson	121
20	Mark Thell	124
21	Michael Hyland	127
22	John Pechin	129
23	Art Haskins	129
24	Rita Vavrosky	131
25	Eric Forland	137

			4
1	Carol Anderson	141	
2	Michael Dahl	146	
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Good evening and thank you, everyone, for coming.

My name is Tracy Smetana, I'm with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. And we are here for the public information meeting for the proposed Sandpiper Pipeline route.

I've included on this opening slide the Commission's docket number for the route permit for this project. That's sort of the key to finding information with our office so I thought it would be useful to have that right upfront.

So this is briefly what we're going to run through this evening. I'll do a little introduction here, talk about the pipeline route permit roles and process. We'll ask the company to provide a brief summary of their proposal. The Department of Commerce will talk about the environmental analysis part of the project. then we'll open it up for the main event, which is your comments and questions.

Due to the number of folks here, we definitely want to make sure that everyone who wants to speak has an opportunity to do that and so we'll ask you to limit your comments to three to five minutes. I will be the timekeeper. You can keep an eye on me, I'll give you the one-minute warning and then the alarm on my phone will go off when we hit five minutes, okay, just to be respectful to all those behind you in line who would like to speak. Thank you.

So, first off, I'd like to just start with a brief introduction of who is the Public Utilities Commission anyway? Some of you folks I know I've spoken with, I recognize a lot of you from other events, but I'm guessing that some of you have not heard of the Public Utilities Commission before or haven't had the opportunity to work with us in the past.

So we regulate permitting for power plants, pipelines, and transmission lines. We also deal with local and in-state long-distance telephone companies, as well as service and rates for investor-owned electric and natural gas utilities.

We have five Commissioners, they are appointed by the governor. They serve staggered terms. So we don't get a whole new batch every time we get a new governor, we have some that were appointed by Governor Dayton, and some that were appointed by governors prior.

We also have about 50 staff that work at

the Commission doing technical things, legal things, consumer area, public information, and so on.

I'd also like to talk a little bit about who's who in this process. If you continue following the project, there are a number of folks that you may interact with or you may hear about or read things about, so I'd like to let you know who is who.

First off we have the applicant. That's the term that we use to describe the company asking for the certificate of need and the pipeline route permit. So in this case the applicant is the North Dakota Pipeline Company. So if you hear someone use the term applicant, that's who they're talking about.

The next one is the Department of Commerce. And they play two different roles in this process. The first is the Energy Environmental Review and Analysis, which you might see abbreviated as EERA. They are, again, another state agency independent of the Public Utilities Commission and they are responsible for conducting the environmental analysis for this project.

The other arm of the Department of Commerce that will participate on the certificate of

1 need side is the Department of Commerce Energy Regulation and Planning group. Their job is to 2 3 4

represent the public interests when utilities ask to make changes that are regulated by the Public

Utilities Commission. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also ask the Office of Administrative Hearings to get involved. They are another state agency, again, separate from the Commission and from the Department of Commerce. They will assign an administrative law judge, which you might see abbreviated as ALJ, to this case. The judge is going to hold hearings, both public hearings up in this area again, also evidentiary hearings, a little bit more formal process where people will provide sworn testimony, cross-examine witnesses and so on. And after all of that, the judge will take all of the information in the record from the start to that point and summarize those facts and make recommendations in the form of a report to the Public Utilities Commission. And, again, it's the Commission that ultimately is responsible for making the decision.

Now, at the Public Utilities Commission there's a couple different staff members that you might be involved with through the process. The

first is me. My name, again, is Tracy, I'm the

public advisor. And my job is to help you figure

out this process. When you can plug in, where you

can plug in, where to get information, how to send

in comments, that type of thing. I'm neutral, I'm

not for the project, I'm not against the project,

I'm not for you, I'm not against you. My job is to

provide information about the process.

My counterpart at the Commission is an energy facility planner, that would be Mr. Scott Ek, he is here this evening. And his job is to help in building the record on more of the technical aspects and inform Commissioners on impacts of various decision alternatives and so on. And, again, he's also neutral, he's not for or against the project or any party or anyone else as part of this project.

So why is the Commission involved in this particular project? Well, because the statutes and rules call this a large energy facility. And so a large energy facility needs a certificate of need from the Commission before it can be built. And so that's going to answer the question, is the project needed.

The other piece of that puzzle is, if it's needed, where is it going to go. And so that's

the piece that we're here to talk about tonight.

That's the pipeline route permit. And, again, the statutes and rules prescribe when that applies to a project like this. And I've included for both of

these pieces the statutes and rules in case you're

6 looking for some bedtime reading tonight.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, when the Public Utilities Commission decides on the route, the statutes and rules provide them some guidance on things they need to consider in making that decision. And so some of these are things that we are relying on you for some help to determine which of these factors exist in the area that's being proposed. Which things do you want considered, which things are most important. So human settlement, the natural environment, archaeological and historic resources, the economy, pipeline costs and accessibility, use of existing rights-of-way where that makes sense, cumulative effects of future pipeline construction. And we also want to make sure the project complies with other regulations, whether they be local, state, federal and so on.

What the statutes and rules don't do with this list is prioritize them. So we ask for citizen help, we ask other state agencies for help in

helping us prioritize that information. And ultimately it's up to the Commission to decide, you know, which ones are most important in various areas.

So if you like pictures here's a chart of what the process looks like. Kind of a high level overview, we didn't want to include every little detail of every little thing that happens. So these are kind of the high points.

So you can see this is the certificate of need process. And I put this one up first because that's the question that has to be answered first, is the project needed, okay. And so step one actually happens before this chart, where the company actually applies for the certificate of need. That's what triggers the whole process.

Okay.

Once they do that, then the Commission reviews the application to say, hey, did they send everything that we need? Did they check off everything on the list to call it an application? When they do, then we say the application is accepted. And so I know that that terminology can be confusing for people. They say, oh, it's accepted, it's already done, what are we doing here?

That's not true at all, it just means it's accepted for further review. So that means we can move on down this chart, okay.

And you can see, as I mentioned earlier, there will be public and evidentiary hearings that the ALJ, that administrative law judge, will oversee, and there will be further information about that schedule as it comes out.

Now, this is a similar picture for the pipeline route permit process. And it looks kind of similar, a lot of the same steps. A couple added features on this one. This is where we are today, these public information meetings, okay. And so we have three purposes at the meeting today. Number one, to provide information about the process and the project. Number two, we want to gather information about alternative routes or route segments that folks may wish to propose. And we also want to gather information about environmental concerns that people may have so that that can go into the environmental analysis. Okay.

From there, the Commission will determine which routes move forward for further analysis. And then we'll move into the public hearings. And at that point the public hearings -- that's where the

two processes sort of merge back together, where when we get to those public hearings we'll be talking both about the need and about the route together, as opposed to right now we're pretty much just talking about the route today.

Now, this is an estimated project timeline. So the key word here is estimated, okay, just based on what the statute and rule requirements are and our past experience with these types of projects.

On Monday there will be a scheduling conference with the administrative law judge to go over and kind of firm up some of these dates a little bit. So after that time then we'll know more about what these dates actually look like. But you can see we're early on in the process, we're at the public information meetings in March.

And as we work through that, you can see we're expecting the public and evidentiary hearings to be in October. Don't plan your vacation around that, it may or may not be true. We'll have to wait until that scheduling order comes out from the judge. And, you know, based on this schedule we're anticipating decisions on the certificate of need and the route permit in January 2015. Again, that

may or may not be accurate, but that's our best guess today.

Now, I mentioned there's a few different ways that folks can participate. One is to attend meetings like you're doing tonight. But for folks that maybe couldn't attend tonight, they might want to submit written comments. And we will have other opportunities down the road for folks to attend meetings and to submit comments. And when we publish a notice about a public meeting or about a comment period where we're looking for your help on something, these are the elements that you'll want to look for.

So now you can see on here, this is an old one from November, right, so these topics have already been addressed. But I just wanted to put up a sample so you can see what are the key elements, what should I look for if I get one of these notices or see it on our website.

So, first off, here we go again with those docket numbers, okay. And there's two different ones. As I mentioned, there's a certificate of need and then there's a route permit. And so when you're communicating with us or looking for information, those are the key pieces that you

want to use to track that information down.

You also want to pay attention to the comment period. There's always going to be a deadline, because we're not going to just keep everything open-ended because we need to move on to that next box on that chart, right. So we need to get these questions answered and these issues resolved and then move on to the next step. So just like a class in school, if your deadline, your project is due today and you turn it in next week, you're probably not going to get credit for it. So the same follows here. You want to pay attention to those deadlines to make sure that your comments are considered as part of the process.

And then the third key point that I want to mention is the topics open for comment. As we move through the process there are different things that we're concerned about, different questions we're asking at different points in time. And so it's most helpful for us if your comments that you send in or that you speak about focus on whatever the topics are that we're interested in today. So you can see back in November and December we were interested in does the application include all the right information. Today we're concerned about

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

different things, as I mentioned earlier, the environmental impacts and alternative routes.

Speaking of alternative routes. some information about what information you need to include if you're going to submit an alternative. Larry Hartman from Commerce is going to speak more specifically about these requirements.

Now, if you're looking to stay informed about the project, there are a number of ways that you can do that. I know that many of you already subscribe or have found other ways to stay informed. If you haven't already subscribed or if you're not already receiving information and you want to know, hey, what's happened in this project so far, or if you thought you missed something, you can go look in what we call our eDocket system.

Everything that happens, every piece of information that's submitted into this record is included in this eDocket system. And so you just go to the search function and you search by docket number, it will bring up the list of everything that's in there.

Now, if you want to just learn about when are there some opportunities for me to weigh in, when are there comments periods, when is the public

hearing, that type of thing, we have a project mailing list that you can sign up for, either U.S. mail or e-mail, to receive information about sort of those milestone events.

If you want to receive an e-mail notification any time something new happens, and I know some of you in the room do this, you can subscribe to receive e-mail notification through the subscription service.

Now, for some folks, if you're not a big e-mail fan, this might not be for you. In some situations you will get a lot more e-mail than you would like to receive, perhaps, and if that is true you can always unsubscribe and then contact me to get switched over to the project mailing list instead. But, again, you'll note that here the key to doing that is those docket numbers again.

And this is just a picture of what that subscription page looks like on the website. I know folks sometimes say, hmm, it was kind of confusing or it wasn't very user-friendly, so I thought having a picture of what it looks like and what information you need to enter might be helpful.

And, again, at the PUC there are two different folks that are your project contacts for

this particular project. Again, I'm Tracy, I'm the public advisor. Feel free to contact me by e-mail or phone. If I'm not in the office, as would be the case this week, I do have counterparts back at the home office to help you out with any questions that you might have. And then, of course, Mr. Ek, I've included his contact information here as well.

And with that I will turn it over to the applicant.

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Barry Simonson, I'm the manager of engineering and construction for our main line side for Enbridge out of Superior.

It seems like we have a packed house tonight, we're in our seventh hearing, I think this is the most we've had, and so I hope we have some very productive question-and-answer sessions this evening.

To my right, I'd like to introduce the panel that we have from Enbridge. We've got Kevin Walli, legal counsel. Mr. Mark Curwin, who is our director of execution for major projects. Mr. John McKay, land services. Paul Meneghini, environment. Art Haskins, emergency response. And John Pechin, operations manager.

So the Sandpiper Pipeline project, what does it consist of? Sandpiper is a pipeline project that begins in the western portion of North Dakota, Tioga, North Dakota, in the Bakken region, obviously, this is all Bakken light crude oil. And it's approximately 616 miles. In North Dakota there's about 300 miles of 24-inch, and then once the pipeline gets into the Minnesota region there's about 75 miles of 24-inch that goes into Clearbrook. And then from Clearbrook to Superior the diameter changes to 30-inch pipeline. And that's about 300 miles in the state of Minnesota.

In terms of construction. We're looking, once we go through the environmental permitting and all the regulatory permitting, we're looking for construction in the winter of 2014, '15, but predominantly construction in 2015 with an in-service date of Q1 of 2016.

A couple other highlights. One of the main things, objectives, that we try to do in routing is we try to follow existing Enbridge-owned utilities and/or other utilities such as electrical power lines and other gas lines, et cetera. So on this project right now and specifically for the state of Minnesota, we're around 75 percent

collocated with what I just mentioned. But I'll get into more detail on Carlton County in just a few minutes.

This is a map of the state of Minnesota. As you can see, in the top left corner is the border of North Dakota and Minnesota. And there's an existing line 81 that Sandpiper parallels that's a line that starts in western North Dakota and goes to Clearbrook. From Clearbrook there will be a new terminal. And from that new terminal the 30-inch pipeline, diameter pipeline will be following existing MinnCan pipeline, pipelines, plural, I should say, there's two or three, headed south from around Park Rapids. And then from Park Rapids the pipeline will traverse in an easterly fashion following an existing Minnesota Power DC line.

You can't see them here, I guess they're not blown up too much. But in terms of Carlton County itself, and when I speak about routing, our initial route that we filed with the PUC had some landowners concerned, citizens concerned, and we did meet with a lot of public outreach in terms of meeting with various counties within the whole route. And in terms of Carlton County, the county commissioners had mentioned that there were issues

with our route, there were landowners that were concerned. So what we did was we asked the county to propose a few different routes that we could look at. And they did and we found a route that, not only from a socioeconomic perspective, but from an environmental perspective was amicable to all parties involved.

And when I mention that, when I say that, in the county of Carlton right now, we're about 95 percent collocated with existing utilities, which is positive. And in addition to that, the supplemental filing that we had on January 31st does indicate that that is our preferred route going forward, just so everyone is aware of that.

Project benefits. What are the benefits of this project? This is North American crude oil out of the Bakken region. And in terms of that, by building this pipeline we're offsetting imports from other countries that may be unstable or unfriendly to U.S. interests.

In terms of jobs, there's going to be many jobs that are created by the construction crews, the contractors that are building it. And with that, local jobs come with that. Local unions, there will be jobs, there will be gas, there's

accommodations, there's restaurants. So there will be a big impact to the economy in the local regions.

In terms of taxes, tax base. In 2011
Enbridge paid around \$34 million in Minnesota
property taxes. And with Sandpiper coming on line
in 2016, we're looking at an additional \$25 million
in tax revenue. So that's a big deal.

What are our priorities? Safety, integrity, and respect. And when we talk about safety, we want to operate our systems reliably. And that goes with how we design the pipeline and our facilities, how we construct, and how we operate. No incident will ever be acceptable to us.

We continually invest in new technologies. And in doing so, in training to protect our employees, residents, and natural resources alike. And, finally, with landowners, we strive for fair and equitable treatment for all landowners along our rights-of-way.

Again, thank you for attending and we look forward to a productive Q and A session with everyone tonight.

Thank you. I'll turn it over to Mr. Hartman.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you. I

would -- can you hear me back there? Sometimes my voice falls off. If I can get some assistance from somebody in the back row, when you cannot hear me, please raise your hand and I'll try to readjust accordingly.

My name is Larry Hartman, I work for the Minnesota Department of Commerce on the Energy Environmental Review and Analysis staff. With me from our staff is Casey Nelson, who is outside helping folks if they want maps. And there's some other introductions I'd like to make a little bit later on at the appropriate time.

As Tracy mentioned, this is the last of our seven scheduled information meetings in the first go-around on this project. We've covered a number of different topics as we've gone across the state on these meetings. Excuse me, there's one thing I did forget already.

We are making an oral recording of -well, we've made oral recordings of all the meetings
so far. We have a court reporter here. Her name is
Janet. And Janet is rather user-friendly. If you
don't pronounce your name clearly and correctly she
will certainly make that known that she needs that
information. So when I call on you to speak later

on, please approach the front, sit down, and speak into the microphone and spell your name for the court reporter.

When the oral record is available, we'll be posting those on eDockets and our website. The oral record will be indexed, so if there's certain subject areas you want to follow you can track that by the index for the various meetings we've held across the eight counties crossed by the proposed pipeline to date.

Janet is also human, so in about an hour and a half we're going to take a 10- to 15-minute break to let her fingers recoup from what is being said by all parties. And, with that, I guess I'll continue. Are you okay, Janet?

COURT REPORTER: I am. So far.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Okay. Again, Tracy has briefly given you a brief overview of the pipeline permitting process.

Pipelines were not regulated by the State of Minnesota prior to 1986, I believe. And the state assumed a greater role in the pipeline jurisdiction after the Moundsview incident. And out of that came a number of things related to pipeline safety. One is a more active Office of Pipeline

Safety. Out of that also came the Gopher State One Call system and also came the rules and regulations for how high-pressure pipelines are permitted in Minnesota.

During the rulemaking process, a lot of you may be familiar with environmental review, and we've had a lot of requests so far for what's called an environmental impact statement. Pipelines are reviewed a little bit differently. There's not a formal EIS.

The Minnesota environmental review rules, which are Minnesota Rules, Chapter 4410.3600, provide for an alternative review process if certain obligations are met. When the rules were adopted they were then authorized by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board. First, the reviser's office, then the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board, and then a month later the Board approved them as an alternative form of review as they satisfied the requirements to enable that to occur.

So an alternative environmental review differs from conventional environmental reviews in several different ways. One, there's not a draft EIS, there's not a final EIS, we prepare what's called a comparative environmental analysis. That

analysis will examine the various routing options proposed either by Enbridge or by route proposals received by us by April 4th of this year.

The environmental analysis will also address comments received at all the public information meetings in greater detail also. We'll also be working with our other state agencies regarding their permitting concerns also.

The environmental review document will be prepared, or we'll start preparation of that after the Commission authorizes the routes to be carried forward for the public hearing. What will happen after the conclusion of the deadline for either route proposals and/or written comments into this record, which is April 4th, we'll then prepare, I guess, our package for the Commission, and then their staff would review that and make their recommendations to the Commission.

Once the Commission determines what routes would be approved, that is the limit or the universe of routes that will be examined at the public hearings to be held later this year. And public hearings will not be held until the comparative environmental analysis is available.

Again, some of you may have different

interests, some of you may just have an interest as to how the route crosses your property. Some people might have an interest on where the entire route is located. A number of concerns have been expressed so far.

You can participate in a number of different ways. If you, as a landowner, are concerned about the route on your property, you think there's a better place for it, I would encourage you to work with your neighbors, because where it's at on your property might affect where it's at on their property also. So, again, I'd encourage you to work together as groups if you so choose.

Some groups and organizations have different interests also. So you can participate at different levels and kind of different degrees of participation should one choose to do so.

Besides route proposals, as I mentioned, there's an opportunity to submit written comments. We accept those comments by e-mail, by fax. We have comment sheets out front. Some people have already turned them in. Those comment sheets, if you haven't picked one up, you might want to before you leave tonight, you can send me your written

comments, fold it pursuant to the directions on the back, put a piece of tape on it, it's postage prepaid, and it has my address on it so it'll come to my desk.

Now, again, if you want to submit a route, you have to do that by April 4th of this year. And we'd encourage you to submit it on a map, aerial photo, plat book, something that's usable, that shows us fairly detailed information if possible. As an illustrative example, this is for a transmission line, an electric transmission line in the southwest portion of the Twin Cities. What appears to me to be purple was what was proposed by the applicant. Alternative routes were proposed, I don't know by who, but, for example, the Commission authorized those routes to be considered at the public hearings. The same sort of analogy for pipelines also, just as an example.

If you can submit that on a map, that would be very helpful. We have a guidance document out at the front table which tells you how to kind of prepare a route recommendation if you want to.

The criteria are on the back of that document also. If you go through that and you have questions, you don't understand what's in there, please give me a

call or Casey Nelson a call. I've got business cards out there on the table. My cell phone number is on the card also, so if you can't contact me during the day, please feel free to contact me in the evening if you have questions also.

Again, try to use criteria to frame your argument for what you think is best for a route alignment. Again, try to work with your neighbors. I won't go through this slide. It just basically provides some rationale to use to support your argument in favor of what you might be proposing. That's also listed in the PowerPoint package that we have out there also.

If there's specific issues or impacts you'd like to see addressed, that's one of the things you might comment on also. I've received numerous e-mails from this area, from the Carlton County Land Stewardship, and I've received a number of comments from residents in all the counties crossed by the proposed alignment so far.

This is just an illustrative example, it's not inclusive nor is it intended to be inclusive. For example, agriculture. Some of the impacts might be methods of soil separation, drain tile repair, soil compaction, organic farmlands,

irrigation systems, crop losses. Perhaps proposed land use plans, residential, industrial, natural resource features, rural water systems, which are common in the western part of the state and southwestern. Roads, water resources, streams, river crossings, wetlands. Forestry clearing of vegetation has been raised. Stand trees, wildlife, cultural resources, archaeological resources.

Again, once the routes come in we have time to prepare our information for the Commission so the Commission would then determine what routes go forward for hearing and also the issues to be evaluated in the comparative analysis.

The comparative analysis will be a written document that evaluates the various routes being proposed and the impacts associated with the project, as well as mitigation requirements -- or mitigation recommendations.

As Tracy mentioned, the hearings will be presided over by an administrative law judge, and that's another opportunity for you to present evidence or information into the record that the ALJ will prepare for Commission consideration.

Other state agencies also have jurisdiction in the permitting process. We

sometimes refer to those as downstream permits.

This is just a listing of some of the agencies.

Obviously, the PUC. We at staff over at the

Department of Commerce perform a separate role, more in terms of just analysis. Other agencies have permitting authority.

Minnesota Department of Natural
Resources, they issue permits for crossing of public
lands and waters and also appropriation permits for
water withdrawal for hydrostatic testing of
pipelines. And Jamie Schrenzel is here from DNR.
Jamie is right here in the front row.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency also issues permits, be it stormwater runoff permits, NEDS permits, water discharge permits, and there might be a couple others that I'm overlooking.

The Minnesota Department of Health, their rules prohibit wells from being within 100 feet of a pipeline. Minnesota -- excuse me, I was going to say Minnesota Department of Health.

The Minnesota Department of
Transportation issues permits for road crossings,
that's state highways. Counties, townships also
issue permits for what their responsibilities are
with roads also.

U

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture also plays a role. The rules or statutes for pipelines and transmission lines require preparation of an agricultural mitigation plan, or what's referred to as an agriculture protection plan also. Bob Patton is here, and Bob's with the Department of Agriculture. He's helping people sign in. He'll be here later on to answer questions once the forum is open. Part of the agriculture protection plan also addresses organic farms.

The last agency I'd like to mention is the Department of Public Safety and the Office of Pipeline Safety. They are responsible for inspection of pipelines, both interstate and intrastate, natural gas as well as liquid lines. I can distinguish those later on if there are questions about that. But they have an ongoing role regarding responsibility.

By law the Commission is precluded from addressing safety-related issues. That falls under the domain of pipeline safety. Now, sometimes those issues you find yourself sitting on the fence, is it environmental or is it safety. And we try to address those in the appropriate fashion.

So these are some of the agencies our

office will be working with in the preparation of the environmental analysis.

Again, our website, which is different from eDockets. We post primarily documents we produce. We've also posted Enbridge's site permit application to our website. If you haven't been there, I'd encourage you to go there. The application is broken down by each section for the main portion of the application, the environmental report, and the aerial photos, USGS maps are there, and they're listed by county, by township, and by milepost along with file size. So we tried to make it easy to use and for the public to download and access those maps also.

And if you want to send me information or route proposals or comments, you can do that by U.S. mail, e-mail, and on our website you can file comments electronically also.

Once we package up everything we get,
that will be posted on eDockets also when we present
it to the Commission or send it to the Commission.

My name, address, telephone number are there if you desire to contact me or Casey. Please feel free to do so, we're there to assist you in any way we can.

Now, again, what I'd like to do is open it up to questions. I have 27 speaker cards so far. For those of you that want to speak, we'd ask that you fill out a card. If you don't have one, I'll have one of our staff members walk through and pass out cards. I have 27, so that comes to 135 minutes by my math. If you have three to five minutes that puts us on a fairly tight schedule.

Again, state your name clearly for the court reporter when you come up. I will call the names in the order I received the cards, and one person has indicated that they would like to speak early on and that's Mark Herwig. So I will call Mark and after Mark the next speaker would be Dan Reed.

MR. MARK HERWIG: Oh, sit here?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: If that one doesn't work, you can have this one.

MR. MARK HERWIG: Okay. Thank you for -- is this on? Mark Herwig, M-A-R-K, H-E-R-W-I-G.

Well, thanks for being here. I appreciate the process.

I own 44 acres of land on the proposed route, six miles west of Mahtowa on County Road 4.

I live in White Bear Lake, Minnesota, two hours

south.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've worked as a volunteer in wildlife conservation since '13 and as a conservation freelance writer since 1981, a full-time conservation employee since 1997. The last 15 years as editor of a national conservation magazine.

It has been a dream of mine all my life to own some land and manage it for wildlife and hunting. After raising a family, building a house, and paying for it all, that dream came true October 2012. Since then, on that land I have planted food plots, oak and fruit trees, enrolled in Minnesota's Sustainable Forestry Initiative and the Federal Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program to create habitat for grouse and deer, which I like to hunt and eat. But the NRCS got me interested in the golden-winged warbler, a bird that may be listed on their Endangered Species Act and it is present on my property. And, in fact, most of the -- something like half the population is in this area.

Then, eight months later, on June 10th, 2013, Enbridge called, wanting to survey my land for an as-yet unapproved oil pipeline. Then I got repeated calls from Eric Bates in January to get me to sign an option for an easement for an unapproved

pipeline.

And, you know, the first guy I talked to was a pretty cool guy. The second guy was kind of pushy, had an attitude, and I didn't appreciate it. They want to run a pipeline over my land, I think he should be a little more polite. And I really felt bullied into thinking that I had to allow a survey on my land, which I didn't. It hasn't even been approved yet. What's the rush?

Nearly all my neighbors in the area purchased land for hunting, camping, relaxation. Hunting and tourism are an important part of this economy up here. The whole state of Minnesota, for that matter.

And already Enbridge is proposing other pipelines to carry tar sand oil from their country in Canada through this area. And I've been told by someone else several more, perhaps seven or eight more.

Why destroy my dream and that of others, including folks who make their livelihood from the land as farmers when other routes exist? For example, the Soo Line route or the route -- Enbridge's oil route that already goes to the north of us.

Please require this foreign company that does not really care about our citizens to build their pipeline somewhere else.

And I just wanted to say, we need fuel.

I need fuel, I drove up here in a fossil-fuel-driven vehicle. This route, however, seems to be in Enbridge's best interest. But you need, the PUC needs to decide, needs to determine if it's the best interest of the state people and its treasured natural resources and area residents and landowners.

I only have 44 acres. I won't have any left or any value to it if seven or eight pipelines are built on it.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Dan Reed was next, and then, following Dan, Betsy Dugan.

 $\label{eq:mr.def} \text{MR. DANIEL REED: My name is Daniel Reed},$ R-E-E-D.

My name is Daniel Reed and I'm on the
Automba Township Board here in western Carlton
County. I've been on many of the area boards over
the years and now I'm a reporter covering the
Carlton County Board for the Moose Lake
Star-Gazette. I am currently the chair of the House
District 11A DFL and I'm also on the DFL Eighth

Congressional Central Committee.

Our area stands at the crossroads of many changes in our economic and social future. The wealth of oil from the Dakotas will pass through our neighborhood in numerous lines as that energy production increases. Vast deposits of copper and other minerals lie under our particular township and wait for the copper-nickel issue of mining and processing and safeguards to our environment to be resolved. I will not speak on those issues because they seem out of our hands.

I do wish to comment on the route chosen by Enbridge across our county, starting in northern Automba Township and heading east. We will live with this route as a township for scores of years, with probably major placement of numerous lines. Site selection matters. Safety of operation matters. That's why I continue to talk about the use of the old Soo Line rail grade as the best corridor to take for these numerous lines of oil and gas. Any pipeline location will be located in watershed areas. Yet the Soo Line route, now a recreational trail, has an existing large corridor already. The corridor has been compromised environmentally already from the scores of years the

trains hauled their cargos, mostly unregulated.

Our infrastructure will have less damage to it with heavy loads during construction since the rail bed is already an existing heavy cargo roadbed. This is a good, cost-effective choice not only for construction, but also for continuing maintenance in the future. It may be a little farther, but it will ease construction costs and not force more lines into our more populated northeastern part of the county.

The route to the Soo Line rail bed historically follows a steady downhill slope to the Superior Enbridge terminal. No additional pump or lift stations are needed from that point on.

Gravity will do the job.

My most important point is my last one.

Once the pipeline is completed and all the current safety precautions are put in place, we along the route will live with any potential problems. We will have to have emergency plans and a response team to minimize any spills or any problems that occur. That is a big concern for us. But more importantly, observations by the residents of the area are critical. The Soo Line Recreational Trail, used by thousands of people year-round, would be the

safest route, a route checked by 1,000 eyes.

The current route travels through areas where locals do not travel even during hunting season. Numerous wetlands. This daily inspection as people recreate along the Soo Line provides just another safeguard for observing a problem and mobilizing a response.

Thank you for your attention and please help us choose the best route for our area.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: After Ms. Dugan is done speaking, the next speaker would be Larry Weber.

MS. BETSY DUGAN: How do you do? My name is Betsy Dugan and I moved to Wrenshall three years ago. One of the draws to moving here was the opportunity to be part of a community that is growing food sustainably. Much of my food is produced by farmers within five miles of my home. Meat, dairy, vegetables, and fruit.

I've been impressed with how Carlton

County is growing as a model of sustainable

agriculture and is attracting new farmers to live,

work, and raise new farmers in this area.

As a Minnesota master naturalist, I'm also in awe of the beauty of Minnesota's forests,

wetlands, and prairies. They're a treasure for future Minnesotans and a valuable resource in themselves.

Although I've been here a short time,
I've come to care deeply about Minnesota. I feel
that the proposed preferred route is a threat to the
source of my food and can irretrievably harm our
natural environment.

I raise the following points.

I see from a revised preferred route followed by Enbridge in January that 75.5 percent of their preferred southern route will be on private land.

Number two. This private land would be taken by eminent domain. The landowner would continue to have to pay taxes on that land, but would be prohibited from many uses such as growing an orchard, building infrastructure such as a pole barn and so forth. The landowner would be subject to Enbridge's whim to come on his property with people and equipment any time Enbridge wanted to.

Number three. Placing the pipeline in a power line corridor significantly and unalterably changes that corridor. To wit: Pipelines can leak and contaminate the soil and water irretrievably.

Also, there is no provision in statute for a buy the farm option. According to Minnesota Statute 216E.12, if a landowner on a proposed power line corridor decides he doesn't want to live with such a liability, there is a provision to make the electric utility buy his land at fair market value. No such protection exists for the landowner on a proposed pipeline route.

Number four. When the pipeline is, quote, decommissioned by Enbridge, when, not if, the oil will run out, Enbridge has publicly stated in their line 3 segment replacement program brochure of 2013 that they will not remove the old pipe and turn the land back to landowner control. Their pipes will remain in the ground. They stated, quote, Landowners will still need to restrict some activities, such as building or digging over the easement whether the line is active or not, unquote. Thus, the landowner will be deprived some uses of his land in perpetuity. This is according to Enbridge's own documents.

Number five. Minnesota has a statute policy of nonproliferation as regards utility corridors.

Number six. One of the PUC criteria for

route selection is effect on natural environment as regards wildlife habitat and water resources.

Construction of a whole new corridor would involve destruction, destruction and fragmentation of forest area, wetland disturbance, and soil upheaval.

Mitigation does not return the land to natural state. Original soil structure is lost, invasive plants are introduced, and ongoing maintenance means no trees and continued disturbance of the area.

This is not conducive to preserving the natural environment.

And I haven't even mentioned the likely possibility of oil leaks in the watershed.

In summary, Enbridge has proposed an entirely new pipeline corridor in Minnesota with many detriments to land-owning Minnesota citizens.

Loss of agricultural land that promises to be vital to our future nutritional needs, and disturbance of pristine natural area.

Enbridge already has a pipeline corridor through Minnesota, the northern route. This was their preferred route for all the pipelines they've put in. The land there has already been disturbed with wetlands crossed and forests cut. The northern route would also stand by the Minnesota

nonproliferation policy.

In light of the above considerations, I think the PUC should consider the northern route the least damaging one for my new home, the great state of Minnesota.

MR. LARRY WEBER: My name is Larry Weber, that's W-E-B-E-R. I am a retired teacher of 40 years. I am presently a naturalist and an author.

30 years ago, we left the city living to move to an old farm in Blackhoof Township of Carlton County. We knew no one here and not much about the region. What we found were pristine forests of oak, maple and basswood, with an abundance of wetlands among the hills of glacial moraine.

We decided to stay here and we decided to leave the land just as it is. We cannot improve on Mother Nature. We also met neighbors who felt as we did about the uniqueness and beauty of this land. What we did not find here were many of the invasive plant species that have so permeated the landscape in many parts of the state. Acreage without these alien invaders is quite unusual. This place was a safe haven.

I began taking daily walks and keeping track of what else and who else was living here.

Over the years, I saw more than 200 species of birds, 65 of which nest here. I also found about 60 kinds of mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish and nearly 50 kinds of butterflies. Each April the woodland wildflowers begin blooming. These flora of the forest floor give way to summer flowers of the open spaces and swamps. I have noted more than 200 kinds of flowering here throughout the seasons. My walks are never without natural discoveries.

Keeping records of what I found led me to write a book about the wildlife at our place. And discoveries of my walks were used in several of my other books.

Now, after 30 years, this valuable natural site is being threatened by an invading pipeline from an outside source. The proposed Enbridge Sandpiper Pipeline will do more to the scene than just carry oil through it. Such a project with its wide corridor will disrupt and destroy this undisturbed woods and wetlands. The project would have detrimental effects on the breeding birds, including the threatened golden-winged warbler, and would negatively impact the other fauna and flora. Furthermore, the traffic here would introduce invasive plants that so far

1 have been kept out.

And this project is not the end, it is the beginning. Once established, other pipelines would be included in this space and further impact the area.

But there is a revised preferred route. Another existing pipeline route is available and should be used. Also, we need to abide by the nonproliferation clause concerning pipeline routes in the county and state.

Let's keep the uniqueness of these undeveloped places in Blackhoof Township to remain that way. No new pipelines corridors here.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
I have is Caroline Johnson. And after Ms. Johnson
would be John Dugan.

MS. CAROLINE JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is Caroline Johnson, C-A-R-O-L-I-N-E. I'm from Wrenshall, Minnesota in Carlton County where I live today and where I was raised on a large dairy farm. I have two brothers and a son who are still dairy farmers in this beautiful town.

My son Adam is a veteran of the last Iraq war and a fourth-generation dairy farmer. In fact,

my grandfather, father, and my son are all veterans of foreign wars and are or were dairy farmers in Wrenshall. They fought in wars defending our freedoms and our rights as landowners in this country.

What rights or freedom do we have when a billionaire oil company can waltz right in here and unearth our valuable farmland? Doing whatever they please to our property, however they please? This brings down the value of our most precious resource, our land, and hurts the quality of life in our community.

When Enbridge came through this area three years ago, they raped our scarce farmland by scraping off the valuable topsoil and never replacing it. If we let another pipeline company come through with this new pipeline, what is going to stop them from doing this again? What is going to stop North Dakota Pipeline Company from carrying new invasive species like leafy spurge into Wrenshall? This invasive species is very toxic to cattle and would be detrimental to a herd of dairy cows. If or when leafy spurge is transported on North Dakota Pipeline's equipment to a farmer's land, it will put the farmer right out of business.

Farmers work way too hard for a huge oil company like North Dakota Pipeline Company to strut in and totally disrupt our livelihood, devaluing our most precious resources. If you don't think farming is everybody's bread and butter, ask yourself this: Can you eat or drink crude oil?

Thank you for your time.

MR. JOHN SANFORD DUGAN: My name is John Sanford Dugan, D-U-G-A-N.

I'm a retired university professor. My wife of 43 years and I live in Carlton County and eat locally produced food. The county's woods and wetlands help protect the Lake Superior watershed, a source of water that we drink. They also provide us with recreation.

North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC's
Sandpiper would open a new conduit to carry oil
across the county to the port of Superior, Wisconsin
for storage and export. No major refineries serving
Minnesota's energy needs are planned. A route
modification proposed last fall promises to avoid
certain properties, but NDPC declines to remove the
original route from consideration.

The installation and subsequent perpetual maintenance that Sandpiper would require would

irreparably damage farmland that has been carefully nurtured, would clearcut developed forests, and would put wetlands at risk. Degraded farmland cannot be restored to its full potential. An easement swath permanently damages the forest, and wetlands face the threat of catastrophe -- witness the Kalamazoo River disaster.

You are no doubt aware that local sourcing of food is a national phenomenon. One indicator of that is the increasing importance of regional food hubs, which manage the distribution of food products between growers and users, like markets, restaurants, and institutions. The Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems' 2013 national survey, and I'll quote, Over 95 percent of food hubs are experiencing an increasing demand for their products and services, end quote.

New food hubs have been recently established in Minnesota. One right in Duluth.

There was a time when almost all food for the Twin Ports was produced locally and the trend is now back in that direction. The Duluth city council is on record recently supporting a, quote, vibrant, dynamic and sustainable local food system, end

quote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, many pipelines that have been in the ground for decades already cross northern Minnesota. The much publicized discovery of oil and gas reserves in North Dakota and Alberta does not justify a proliferation of new transport pathways across undisturbed land in our state. Routes that have already been negotiated should be the preferred solution. Engineering ingenuity and technological advances can find a way to remove aging conduits and put in ones that will meet alleged needs.

What we have seen in the last eight months is a large corporate entity attempting to force landowners and small businesses to cooperate in a plan of new pipeline proliferation. Most of whose benefits will go to the corporate interests outside the state. Reasonable stewardship of the land requires consideration of long-term issues like how can this land best serve the needs of Minnesotans. Such planning can occur through established representative institutions. Until that happens, the PUC can best meet citizen interests by restricting pipelines to corridors that already exist.

No pipeline proliferation. More cowbell,

1 less pipeline. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
I have is John Fisher-Merritt. And following that
will be Tim Anderson.

MR. JOHN FISHER-MERRITT: My name is John Fisher-Merritt, J-O-H-N, F-I-S-H-E-R - M-E-R-R-I-T-T.

When I started farming in Carlton County in 1976, there wasn't much of a market for locally-owned and grown vegetables and no market for local organically-grown vegetables, so it took a long time to get started making a living at it. now local produce is very popular and local organic vegetables bring premium prices. Whole Foods Co-op in Duluth sells over \$2 million a year in produce, mostly organic. Community-supported farms are providing organically-grown produce to nearly 1,000 families in the area. Many restaurants and even institutions like Essentia Health and UMD are purchasing organic produce. The fact is that demand is increasing along with availability, creating economic opportunity for farmers in Carlton County, where the best soils in northern Minnesota lie.

In our area, the proposed southern pipeline route goes through several farms whose

soils are primarily Campia silt loam, the best soil type in northern Minnesota. Even in cases where this land isn't farmed organically and isn't currently producing high-value crops, or is even run down through misuse, the potential still remains. Farmers are aging and will eventually be willing to sell to talented beginners who will use the land to its full potential. A pipeline easement would significantly reduce or eliminate their ability to do so.

Two of our former interns are among those talented beginners. They have purchased good farmland from aging farmers that lies close to the proposed pipeline corridor. These two young farmers are producing crops whose value approaches \$25,000 per acre per year, demonstrating the potential of this good land to provide enterprising, energetic farmers with a livelihood.

In spite of Enbridge's claims to the contrary, the 120-foot strip of land disturbed by construction activity, compacted by heavy machinery, with the mixing of soil horizons during installation of the pipe and the resulting destruction of soil biodiversity would make it very difficult, if not impossible, to produce high-value, organically grown

crops, especially if the establishment of a new corridor resulted in multiple pipelines. The likelihood of multiple pipelines is great, considering the potential number of oil wells in the Bakken oil fields and burgeoning tar sands production.

In a bold move to protect economic development potential in Carlton County, our county commissioners met with Enbridge officials, insisting that the Sandpiper preferred route avoid private land in the organic and sustainable agricultural area of Carlton County as much as possible, following existing utility easements. Enbridge officials followed their recommendations and amended the preferred route to more clearly follow existing power line and pipeline rights-of-way east of Interstate 35. This represents a marked improvement over the original preferred route.

But the evidence clearly demonstrates that opening a new pipeline corridor which crosses any prime farmland would adversely affect economic development in Carlton County. I strongly urge the Public Utilities Commission to continue to adhere to their long-standing nonproliferation policy and require the proposed Sandpiper pipeline to follow

1 the already established pipeline corridor, the northern route. 2 I asked earlier if I could ask a 3 4 question. Is it appropriate to do that right now? 5 Okay. I read in the newspaper that the 6 Sandpiper Pipeline will carry 375,000 barrels of crude oil per day between Clearbrook, Minnesota and 7 Superior, Wisconsin. Is that a correct figure? 8 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: 9 This is Barry 10 Simonson. Yes, that's correct. 11 MR. JOHN FISHER-MERRITT: Okay. Multiply 12 that by 365 and you get 125,875,000 barrels per 13 year. Now, I read in your promotional 14 15 information that your delivery record is 99.999 16 percent. Is that figure pretty much correct? 17 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: That's correct. 18 MR. JOHN FISHER-MERRITT: Now, when I --19 correct me if I'm wrong, but when I do the math I 20 find that somewhere along the Sandpiper Pipeline 21 someone could receive an unexpected gift of 1,258.75 22 barrels or nearly 53,000 gallons of hydrofracked 23 Bakken crude oil. 24 Thank you. 25 MR. TIM ANDERSON: My name is Tim

Anderson. That's T-I-M and A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. I'm here as a private citizen and not as a member of the Carlton County Land Stewards.

My wife and I own land that is bisected by the North Dakota Pipeline Company's original southern route proposal. I grew up in Minneapolis, but after spending one summer on a canoe trip in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, the value of land stewardship and preservation was etched as deeply in my soul as the glaciers that carved the granite shield of northern Minnesota.

I have a bachelor's degree in biology and a master's in environmental education from the University of Minnesota. I have been a biology teacher at the secondary and postsecondary levels for over 30 years, so I feel qualified to address some of these issues. As you can tell, the Boundary Waters trip was a defining moment in my life.

We bought our 40-acre parcel in Carlton

County so we could have a sanctuary to preserve from human development, a small piece of our own wilderness where we could enjoy its pleasures and instill in our children the true value of nature that I learned for the first time on that canoe trip. This value is not measured in gallons or

barrels of oil, but in immeasurable beauty and environmental benefits like carbon sequestration to help minimize climate change, nutrient cycling, water filtration and erosion control to provide clean drinking water and improve the health of our watersheds, including the Red, Mississippi, and Nemadji Rivers, all of which will be crossed by the proposed pipeline and subjected to the toxic effects of the oil spill. And preservation of wildlife habitat and the earth's critical need for biodiversity, which provides food, medicine, and enjoyment for our welfare.

As a point of fact, there are currently
31 species in Carlton County recognized as rare,
threatened, endangered, or of special concern by the
Department of Natural Resources, including the
golden-winged warbler, which is also a national
species of concern.

These environmental benefits are recognized by the State of Minnesota as being vital to our state and are specifically outlined in Minnesota Rules 7852.1900, which was referenced earlier in the presentation. Subparagraph 3, which states, and I quote, In selecting a route for designation and issuance of a pipeline routing

permit, the MPUC shall consider the impact of the pipeline on the natural environment and its natural resources, close quote.

In addition, Minnesota Statute 116D.01 states, and again I quote, The purpose of laws 1973, Chapter 412, are to promote efforts that will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere, close quote.

And, finally, subdivision 2 of Minnesota Statute 216D.02 states -- and again I'm quoting -- It is the continuing responsibility of the state government to discourage ecologically unsound aspects of population, economic and technological growth and develop and implement a policy such that growth occurs in an environmentally acceptable manner; define, designate, and protect environmentally sensitive areas; minimize the environmental impact from energy production and use; and preserve important existing natural habitats of rare and endangered species, close quote.

In my estimation, the state would be grossly negligent if it were to grant NDPC permission to damage over 600 miles of undisturbed forest, prairie, and aquatic ecosystems, and hundreds of acres of farmland to construct and

1 operate a pipeline to carry extremely volatile fracked oil from North Dakota to Superior, 2 Wisconsin, where it, according to the Wall Street 3 4 Journal, is likely destined for foreign ports via 5 Lake Superior, the largest and most pristine of the Great Lakes. 6 The toxic effects of a potential oil 7 8 spill can clearly be seen in Michigan's Kalamazoo River, which still remains foul years after an NDPC 9 10 pipeline spilled over a million gallons of oil.

For these documented reasons, I implore the MPUC to shoulder its responsibility and deny NDPC's certificate of need or require them to route the proposed Sandpiper Pipeline in their existing northern route right-of-way.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker would be Mary Anderson.

And it's around 7:25, so after Mary does her presentation we'll take a short break, then, for the court reporter.

MS. MARY ANDERSON: Okay. My name is Mary Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.

I am opposed to the North Dakota Pipeline Company's proposed Sandpiper Pipeline. My husband

16

17

11

12

13

14

15

1819

2021

22

23

2425

and I own 40 acres along the original southerly
route in Carlton County. As such, we are members of
the Carlton County Land Stewards, but I'm speaking
on my own because we raise dairy goats on our land

and are concerned about the impact.

Neither of us are originally from this area. 25 years ago, when we were looking for an area to move to, settle on, and raise our children, we knew northern Minnesota was one of the few remaining untouched true wilderness areas in the country. Minnesota was also known for being a progressive state that has legislation in place which promotes efforts that will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and stimulates the health and welfare of human beings, all of which are core values of ours.

We wanted to settle on land that would allow us to be self-sufficient, raise our children to know the value of the land and appreciate the creation that God has given us and teach them the importance and responsibility that each individual has in taking care of our earth and its precious resources.

We have worked very hard for years to achieve self-sufficiency and to be good stewards of

the land. This is now in jeopardy. The original southerly route would cut our 10-acre woods in half and bisect our 30-acre hayfield at a 45-degree angle. This field supplies the food for our dairy goats.

As we near retirement, we had hoped to expand our dairy goat herd. But the destruction of our land by the construction of a pipeline would eliminate a portion of the goats' food source. A pipeline traversing our property would also prevent us from being able to organically certify our goat milk.

The potential harmful effects of an oil spill are also a concern. The impact of a spill would be enormous. Enbridge does not have a good track record concerning oil spills. They are responsible for the largest inland oil pipeline spill in U.S. history in Kalamazoo, Michigan, which is still not completely cleaned up.

A spill on our property would destroy the land that the goats graze on and feed on. It would also contaminate the groundwater used by them and ourselves.

If you approve this pipeline construction, and we hope not, I strongly urge you

to follow the principle of nonproliferation and locate this pipeline along the existing northern pipeline corridor to minimize damage to the environment, farms, and our livelihood.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is for a Brenda Schillo, S-C-H-I-L-D.

MS. BRENDA SCHILLO: Good evening. I'm here representing myself, I'm Brenda Schillo.

My homestead is located on one of the routes submitted to the PUC by Enbridge.

Last summer, I received a certified

letter from Enbridge stating my property was located
on a proposed Sandpiper route. I immediately did
research on Enbridge to learn about this company
that would possibly have eminent domain power over
my family's property. And I learned a lot.

Then late in 2013 Enbridge filed a legal document with the PUC stating the company was now known as the North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC.

I guess I have more of a question than a comment. If the landowners on the chosen route are expected to negotiate legally binding contracts with NDPC, should landowners be concerned that NDPC is a limited liability corporation and not Enbridge?

Thank you.

Should I be concerned?

MR. MARK CURWIN: Again, Mark Curwin with our major projects management team in Superior.

The name change came about as a result of a transaction that was associated with the proposal. One of the anchor shippers of the proposed Sandpiper pipeline is Marathon. And in our discussions with them regarding the project, we entered into an agreement whereby they are funding part of the cost of construction of the project, as well as they've taken a minority interest in our North Dakota system. Once that transaction was completed recently, as you know from when the application -- the name change was filed, we changed the name of the organization. It's merely a name change in that sense.

MS. BRENDA SCHILLO: I think there's more to a name and I think I need more information on the name change.

MR. MARK CURWIN: There's public information about it. That's what it is. Nobody is trying to hide anything. It's still Enbridge, we still operate the North Dakota pipeline system and we will still operate the Sandpiper Pipeline system if it gets approved.

MS. BRENDA SCHILLO: 1 Thank you. MR. MARK CURWIN: 2 Okav. MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card 3 I have is Jane Fisher-Merritt. And following her 4 5 would be Margaret Schulstrom. MS. JANE FISHER-MERRITT: Hi. My name is 7 Jane, J-A-N-E, Fisher-Merritt, F-I-S-H-E-R -M-E-R-R-I-T-T. 8 9 So my name is Jane Fisher-Merritt and 10 I've been an organic farmer in Carlton County for 40 11 years. In the early -- this is kind of a broken 12 record, but I guess we wouldn't order it when we 13 turned in our cards. 14 Early maps of the Enbridge Sandpiper 15 route showed the pipeline crossing three 40-acre 16 parcels of our certified organic farm south of 17 Wrenshall. Then the original route submitted with 18 Enbridge's PUC application had the pipeline moved 19 just feet from our northern boundary. The amended 20 route submitted in January as Enbridge's preferred 21 route has the pipeline approximately two miles north 22 of our land in the existing northern corridor. 23 And I do want to thank you at Enbridge 24 for making that change. And I want to state clearly

that the amended preferred route is a vast

25

improvement and I believe the best choice of the two Enbridge has placed before the PUC. So I am really, I guess, speaking to the PUC and DOC about why that was the better choice.

My reason is that northern Minnesota can't afford to lose scarce farmland to pipeline construction. My husband and I began our vegetable operation in southern Carlton County without knowing much about soil types. We found we had expected more from the soil than that farm could provide. Organic vegetables require very fertile, nutrient-rich soils with a complex mix of ecological components.

Using the county soil survey map, we learned the locations of the soil types that could grow vegetables. We began to search for a farm with Campia silt loam and found this soil type on the farm at our present location near Wrenshall. Only two percent of the land in Carlton County is classified as Campia silt loam. That's what I call scarce farmland.

Food Farm has become the premier organic vegetable farm in northern Minnesota. We were chosen as Organic Farmers of the Year in 2012. My point is that it was the change of location to a

better soil type that made our success possible.

My husband and I have mentored beginning farmers in this region from Grand Marais, Embarrass, Saginaw, the Duluth area, Wrenshall, Mahtowa, and Mora. We know from our own experience and from working with other farmers the irreplaceable value of soils and these soil types. We want you to understand that good soils are not fungible, were formed through the interaction of minerals, plants, animals, water, microbial life in this place over eons and cannot be recreated by backfill.

I am very grateful that resolutions on the route passed by Blackhoof and Wrenshall Townships and in negotiations with Enbridge by our county commissioners to keep the route from crossing the sustainable district and our farm and others demonstrates that this community values an environment where restorative economy and agriculture can thrive.

This is my experience farming in eastern Carlton County. Campia silt loam is not the only soil type considered to be prime farmland, but I must tell you I'm very concerned that in the pipeline routing application NDPC states that, quote, Approximately 61.2 percent of the soils

1 within the project area are considered prime farmland, unquote. 2 3 It is imperative that the PUC, OAH, DOC, 4 DNR, and agencies responsible to protect the 5 long-term public interest consider the impact to 6 food security for Minnesotans. Producing our food 7 takes more than dirt, it requires good soil. 8 Thank you. MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I'll call the next 9 10 two speakers, because I'm assuming they're husband 11 and wife, and that would be the Schulstroms, 12 Margaret and Steven. 13 MS. MARGARET SCHULSTROM: No, I'm his 14 daughter. 15 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I put my foot in my 16 mouth. 17 MS. MARGARET SCHULSTROM: Just a little. 18 My name is Margaret Schulstrom. Hello. That's M-A-R-G-A-R-E-T, S-C-H-U-L-S-T-R-O-M. 19 20 I live with my family on a farm 21 specifically chosen for its lack of utility 22 corridors of any kind. We view the tasks of raising 23 our own food and caring for the land as paramount to 24 our way of life. I feel that crude oil pipelines 25 should be routed with other crude oil pipelines. Ι

ask you to consider the following.

Enbridge Energy already has a corridor that runs from North Dakota to Wisconsin. I fail to see why another corridor is necessary. They tell us that the current corridor, the northern route, is too full, and that there are numerous pinch points on that route. I feel that it is the company's task to fix this problem in the least invasive way instead of passing the burden on to landowners who,, frankly, don't wish to be burdened by the construction, placement, maintenance, and likely failure of the line. If Enbridge has a problem, the company should solve it while causing the least amounts of impact to others.

As I'm sure you are aware, the safety of Enbridge's lines leaves much to be desired. While they boast about over 99 percent safety on the pipelines, when the lines do fail the cleanup is sorely lacking. It is not what is transported safely that matters, it's what's left behind.

One of the first things we learn when handling a firearm is that a gun's safety is a mechanical device and it can fail. No one can honestly deny that this is true for more things than firearms.

Crude oil does not belong in farmland, forests, wetlands, rivers, lakes, or ponds. That any landowner should have to live with this is frightening, but even worse is that a landowner who has previously had no utilities or only a high-voltage power line would be saddled with this atrocity.

By following the southern preferred route the pipeline would traverse hundreds of parcels of land heretofore untouched by this type of energy corridor. High-voltage power lines and crude oil pipelines do not present identical concerns. The effects of the power lines are nothing like those of a crude oil pipeline. For routing purposes, grouping the two together into the category of utility corridors lacks perspicacity. Landowners who purchased land with power lines should not have to contend with this much greater threat.

For the reasons outlined above, I feel that the northern route is a much more appropriate location for an additional pipeline. Siting pipelines together just makes sense. There is only one corridor to inspect, one set of landowners affected, only one stretch of land debased. I therefore ask that if this pipeline is to be built

1	at all, that it be sited on the northern route.
2	Thank you.
3	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Steve Schulstrom.
4	MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: That was my
5	daughter.
6	Steve Schulstrom, S-T-E-V-E,
7	S-C-H-U-L-S-T-R-O-M.
8	Thank you all for coming. This has been
9	just great. I'm actually going to ask you guys some
10	questions. Is that okay?
11	MR. KEVIN WALLI: Yeah, that's fine.
12	MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: Okay. As
13	Mr. Hartman stated, it's best to work with your
14	neighbors if you're interested in proposing a route
15	segment. But it would seem to me that the more
16	neighbors you could talk to, the better.
17	Keeping that in mind, why does Enbridge,
18	North Dakota Pipeline Company, believe that keeping
19	the list of affected landowners a secret is in the
20	public interest?
21	MR. KEVIN WALLI: Keeping the list
22	secret?
23	MR. MARK CURWIN: I'm not really sure
24	what you mean by that, Steve.
25	MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: You don't know

what I mean?

MR. MARK CURWIN: Can you elaborate on that? What really is your question?

MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: I wrote it down here so I wouldn't get mixed up.

Why are you keeping the landowner list secret, under a trade secret?

MR. KEVIN WALLI: In this proceeding and in past proceedings, there have been circumstances where people have sought the list and then they've used it to solicit landowners. So the request has been made that the list of landowners not be published so that people are not contacted for reasons that may have nothing to do with the routing that's in question.

So everyone who's on the list receives their notices, we're obliged to be in contact with everybody, but the list itself isn't available to everyone. It's not a public document.

MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: Why isn't it a public document?

MR. KEVIN KALUZNIAK: As I said, there have been instances where people have tried to use the list to solicit people for their own business purposes. And that was deemed by a judge not to be

1 an appropriate use of the list. MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: So working with 2 our neighbors is not a good idea? Because I'm not 3 4 looking to solicit a list for business purposes. 5 MR. KEVIN WALLI: I think the object that was raised by the Department staff is a valid point, 7 to work with your neighbors. I think reaching out to your neighbors, just those who you know, and 8 9 expanding your network through meetings such as this 10 is maybe the most effective way to do that. 11 MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: It would be more 12 effective if we had the resources of Enbridge, North 13 Dakota Pipeline Company, to do so. Thank you. Second question. 14 15 MR. KEVIN WALLI: Okay. 16 MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: Given that the 17 public comment and public input are important for 18 this project, what is the thinking behind North 19 Dakota Pipeline Company purchasing easements ahead 20 of the PUC determining the actual route? 21 MR. MARK CURWIN: We recognize that 22 that's completely at our risk, Steve. If the PUC 23 were to decide to not approve the project, then 24 that's at our risk.

MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM:

So you're just --

25

1 that's at your risk, but what was the thinking behind doing it that way? 2 MR. MARK CURWIN: It's part of planning, 3 4 that's how you plan a large infrastructure project. 5 You need to progress certain aspects of it so it can 6 be completed at the right time if it gets approved. 7 MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: This question is kind of a follow-up question for the -- not the PUC, 8 but the Department of Commerce. 9 10 Do you think that that is an appropriate 11 use of -- I don't know exactly what I'm looking for, but it seems like it would squelch public input, 12 13 even though we have a lot of people here even though 14 they did that. 15 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Perhaps I'll try to 16 respond to that as best I can. 17 Again, the PUC regulates a number of 18 different entities. There's a big difference 19 between, say, companies that operate pipelines 20 versus electric utilities or telephones. 21 For example, electric utilities only 22 build facilities that are initially approved -- are 23 initially approved by the Midwest Independent System

Operator. So in that sense the utilities are

heavily regulated. There's no such kind of overview

24

25

or planning agency for pipelines, it's more of a free market situation.

Historically, when jurisdiction resided with the MEQB and as it resides with the Commission now, the Commission is not involved in what the financial transactions are between the company and a landowner and/or landowners, per se. You know, given the timing of things and, again, as Mark indicated, it's at their own risk.

So, for example, if they came to you and you decided to sign -- and I'm not saying you're going to or you have to or anything else -- and they gave you a check, that check is -- you can cash the check, and if the pipeline goes someplace else, again, it's at their own risk.

If they do acquire easements during the permitting process, which they are allowed to do, they cannot use that as a means of convincing the Commission that this should be our route because we have easements. So, again, it's at their own risk.

On previous pipeline projects the same things have occurred. The fact that they've acquired easements has never been mentioned by the applicant as a supporting reason. It's something that the Commission is aware of, the fact that it

1 will not be considered by the Commission as a factor. So, again, it's at Enbridge's risk. 2 MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: Thank you very 3 much for that clarification. 4 5 Do I have another two minutes? MS. TRACY SMETANA: 3:20. MR. STEVE SCHULSTROM: Thank you. 7 8 So my statement is real easy. I have a 9 certified organic farm that may be in the path of 10 the Sandpiper Pipeline. A lot of the criteria for 11 routing is socioeconomic. Accordingly, I have the 12 following comments. 13 Some people are ambivalent about land use 14 issues, other people are very particular about how 15 their land is used, and I will fall into the last 16 category. It's really quite simple. We would not 17 be able to tap our maple trees, maple syrup, if 18 those maple trees are gone. A pipeline would 19 destroy our farm's future. It's just that simple. 20 Thank you. 21 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Before I call the 22 next speaker, I'd like to check with Janet. Do you 23 need a break at this point in time? 24 COURT REPORTER: I think I'd like a break. 25 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I have 7:46, why

don't we reconvene at 8:00. And we'll announce that over the microphone also. Again, I'm here if you have questions of me, there are also representatives of Enbridge here. If you need maps, they're available out there, please go to the table and the staff out there will assist you. (Break taken from 7:46 to 8:00.)

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The court reporter has requested if you have a written statement to try to encapsulate it or hit the high points and then give that document to the court reporter and she'll put everything into the record. And that might shorten up the time and give everybody an opportunity to speak, otherwise we may run into a time restriction problem and we'd certainly like to hear from everybody. So thank you.

And, with that, the next speaker would be Eric Forland. I'm sorry. Loretta Carter -- Cartner?

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: My name is Loretta Cartner, L-O-R-E-T-T-A. C-A-R-T-N-E-R.

I live on County Road 1 about two miles south of Wrenshall. My life has been in turmoil after being notified by Enbridge pipelines that they proposed a hazardous liquid pipeline near our home.

When we chose to live in this area, we intentionally searched for a location surrounded by a diverse forest and compatible agriculture and away from electrical and pipeline right-of-ways. The large tract of pristine forest immediately east of our property is ecologically diverse and is transected by numerous small tributaries that flow

into the State of Minnesota recognized Clear Creek, which then flows into the Nemadji River, both protected watersheds.

This forest functions as a wildlife corridor between Jay Cooke State Park and the Nemadji State Forest and beyond. We've seen a variety of mammals such as otters migrate to the area, which is amazing on the snow. It harbors many deer and nesting owls and other birds. There are beaver ponds and a variety of forest types. All at risk of a hazardous liquid pipeline corridor to invade right through the heart of this pristine area.

To our south and west, we live within a vibrant and expanding organic sustainable farming community, which is a huge bonus since I strongly believe in these principles and directly benefit from our neighbors' care of the land.

I cringe at the thought of a hazardous liquid pipeline invading our community and potentially destroying the delicate balance of the surrounding ecosystem and negatively affecting the socioeconomics of their ventures. It could risk future economic growth of sustainable farming in our area.

I also fear for my safety and well-being living just 200 feet from the proposed high-pressure hazardous liquids pipeline. As we all know, a pipeline leaks and accidents cannot be completely avoided and they do happen. Small leaks are often not detected early enough to avoid contamination of the soil and groundwater.

My drinking water well is located 250 feet downgradient from the proposed pipeline. Large spills and explosions can be devastating to me, my family, and property. According to Enbridge's 2012 corporate social responsibility summary, over five million gallons of pipeline liquids transported over the previous ten years are missing. One can surmise that much of this hazardous liquid was lost to these spills.

Our property value with or without hazardous spills would depreciate. Local accounts indicate selling a home near a pipeline would increase the length of time it takes to sell a property and, on top of that, a reduced selling price. Understanding that public perception drives value is the foundation in analyzing the effect that hazardous liquids pipelines have on property value. Our livelihood is at risk.

I do not believe private individuals should bear the burden of what a government considers a public purpose. The constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article I - Bill of Rights, says Private property shall not be taken, destroyed or damaged for public use without just compensation, therefor first paid or secured. Yet the process for assessing compensation through eminent domain along hazardous liquid pipelines falls short of the negative financial impacts to landowners and property values. This includes not receiving full compensation for the devaluation of adjoining property to the right-of-way and connecting parcels in the estate.

As a result of case law, the State has statutes that account for just compensation for electrical transmission takings under eminent domain and attempt to protect the landowner from unjust takings. In fact, it goes even further to require companies to buy a property if a landowner feels they do not choose to live near a transmission line. Unfortunately, the State falls short of protection to landowners impacted by proposed hazardous liquid pipeline eminent domain procedures who find themselves struggling for social and economic

justice on their own.

So, when I heard that the Carlton County
Commissioners and Enbridge were working together to
search for a revised pipeline route that would
improve compatibility with land uses and valuable
environmental and economic resources in our area, I
felt a sense of guarded relief. They both recognize
there are socioeconomic and natural resource impacts
of pipelines and acknowledge the importance of
protecting the sustainable agriculture community in
our area and to reduce natural resource degradation.
They found a way to more closely comply with the
state's pipeline routing criteria by keeping the
route as close as possible to existing
rights-of-ways.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Excuse me, that's five minutes.

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: Five minutes?

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Yep. So to allow other people an opportunity, if you can turn the paperwork in, we'll add that to the record.

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: Okay. All right.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Thank you.

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: I would like to get some questions answered.

1 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: We'll take a few 2 questions. MS. LORETTA CARTNER: What criteria will 3 4 the PUC use to decide whether a route proposed by 5 the public will be included in the comparative 6 environmental analysis at the hearings? 7 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I guess that question is directed towards me. Did you pick up a guidance 8 document out there at the front table? 9 10 MS. LORETTA CARTNER: Yes. I did. 11 Okay. If you'd go MR. LARRY HARTMAN: 12 through and you read that, it tries to be 13 self-explanatory. I guess I gave a written example 14 up there, too. Rather than perhaps taking time to 15 try to explain it, I could go on for that, but if 16 you want to call me we can certainly discuss that 17 later on and I'd be glad to assist you. 18 MS. LORETTA CARTNER: I understand how to 19 submit an alternative. What I'm asking is what 20 criteria will the PUC use in deciding whether or not 21 they're going to allow that alternative to be 22 analyzed? 23 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: If I can speak from 24 past experience in other projects, almost all of 25 them except one, I believe, has gone forward to the

Commission. Again, the one that was not considered by the Commission, that was a MinnCan project, it was around the Twin Cities area. Those two original pipelines were built in the '50s. I remember my father used to farm some of that. There were perhaps a couple thousand homes built immediately adjacent to the pipelines in the Minnesota pipeline system and physically there just wasn't room there and you'd be tearing out sheds, houses, garages, as well as homes and they certainly wanted to avoid that. So that was dismissed by the Commission as being a viable alternative to carry forward to public hearings.

For the most part we will go through, review them, and if we feel we need more information, at least I do, I will contact you and work with you to kind of bring it up to that level and then I'll pass it on to the Commission with a recommendation.

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: All right. Very good. And let's see. Will the public have opportunity to comment on DNR and MPCA permits prior to the issuance of the routing permit? Certificate of need?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The primary permit is

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

issued by the Commission. The other permits typically aren't issued until after the Commission has made a determination. That doesn't mean they haven't applied to those agencies for the permits. It allows them to go through and do the review process.

I believe the way the law is written that the Commission has to make a determination on whether there's a need for it and then a route permit and then other downstream agencies would issue the permits that they are responsible for. That also includes permits from, typically, you know, road crossings, railroad crossings, watershed districts, watershed management areas, and all the other entities.

I believe, if I remember correctly, and perhaps Enbridge can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe on the Alberta Clipper project they needed over 400 different permits, I'm thinking about 450, but I may be vague on that.

MS. LORETTA CARTNER: My question was, though, is there a public process to participate in those permits? Because I understand there's probably some mitigations that maybe would be --

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The agencies will

1	specify mitigation. The DNR makes recommendations
2	into our record. They may propose additional routes
3	or route segments, as maybe the Minnesota Pollution
4	Control Agency also, based on their review of data
5	they receive from Enbridge regarding water quality
6	issues, you know, downstream, you know, downstream,
7	upstream, depending on the way the water flows. I'm
8	not familiar with the details of those permitting
9	processes to know.
10	MS. LORETTA CARTNER: That's what I was
11	curious about. I'll get ahold of those agencies.
12	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: And, again, I can
13	also find out on your behalf and let you know, if
14	that would be easier for you also. And there is a
15	representative from DNR here if you'd like to speak
16	to her, Jamie, sitting right here. Okay?
17	MS. LORETTA CARTNER: Okay. Good, thank
18	you.
19	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Do you have any other
20	questions?
21	MS. LORETTA CARTNER: I do, but I'll let
22	others speak.
23	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you.
24	The next speaker card I have is
25	Mr. Rodnev Porter. And after that. Russell Pollak.

1 I believe.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. RODNEY PORTER: Hello. My name is Rodney Porter, R-O-D-N-E-Y, P-O-R-T-E-R. And I'll apologize because I'm not going to be nearly as polished as the previous speakers.

I live in Mahtowa. I have my entire life. I'm a fourth generation of a family and my son will be the fifth generation on the same property.

Enbridge speaks of respect for the landowner. I have a hard time believing that. The reason why I say this, this all started off with letters saying that they wanted permission to survey. That permission was never granted. And yet you proceeded. And when questioned upon it, you refuted the fact that you had been there, although I have photographic proof that you were.

One thing the PUC should -- and the public should keep in mind. Your rights aren't the rights you think you have.

I have a couple questions for Enbridge. Why not follow the northern route? MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Thanks for your question, Mr. Porter.

Early on in the routing process we --

21

22

23

24

25

obviously, there are six or seven Enbridge-owned pipelines that do traverse across the states of North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin. In terms of the northern corridor, being that there are six or seven pipelines, and part of the routing process is to look at where can we route a pipeline with existing utilities, whether they're Enbridge-owned or other utilities.

In terms of that corridor at this point in time, with the last pipeline being placed in 2009 through there, there's encroachment onto additional population centers that go through Bemidji, it goes through Cass Lake, it goes through Grand Rapids, Cohasset. As well as the last pipeline that was placed, there are additional transmission lines that have been placed from Bemidji all the way to Grand Rapids, which are adjacent to the existing lines that Enbridge owns.

That being said, there would be additional new routes and bumpouts that would need to occur within the Chippewa National Forest, for example. So there's much more encroachment on that right-of-way at this point in time and that's part of the reason -- that's predominately the reason why we chose the southern route, as I've shown on the

screen previously.

MR. RODNEY PORTER: The next question I have for you, and this will be fairly specific, I'm going to be filing for a route change.

In Carlton County you follow a power line corridor until you reach the town of Mahtowa. Then for some unforeseen reason you divert south, parallel almost to Highway 4 until you reach I-35. For two miles you divert from that power line. Then you swing back right back to that power line. Why? Just to take more land? Is it a grab?

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: No. To answer that question, in terms of the routing through the western side of I-35, with that power line being there there are more extensive wetlands that exist once you route easterly, so that's part of the reason why, from an environmental perspective, we decided to route further to the south than bump back up into that corridor, that electrical corridor you're speaking of.

MR. RODNEY PORTER: Thank you.

One question I have is how can the company, Enbridge or North Dakota Pipeline, whatever you choose to call yourselves, ask landowners in your easement to bypass Minnesota state statutes

1 upon the depth at which a petroleum line should be buried on agricultural property? Instead of the 2 state statute at the four and a half feet, you're 3 4 asking these landowners to allow you to bury it at a 5 shallower depth of three feet. How in good conscience and on your record for safety can you ask these landowners to do that? 7 MR. MARK CURWIN: Mark Curwin again. 8 9 Our federal regulations have a 10 requirement of three feet depth of cover. So that 11 is standard for our industry. The state has a 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

requirement of a deeper cover and also that the landowner can waive that by statute. It has to be a clear waiver, but it's entirely voluntary on the part of the landowner. It's a lot -- from a construction standpoint, the deeper you go, the bigger impact there's going to be on your property.

MR. RODNEY PORTER: Isn't it also cheaper to dig shallower, sir?

MR. MARK CURWIN: It has nothing to do with cost.

MR. RODNEY PORTER: Oh, it doesn't, when you're moving 30 percent more soil?

MR. MARK CURWIN: We have many locations where we cross wetlands, rivers, roads, drainage

1 ditches, where we're deep.

MR. RODNEY PORTER: Okay. My final thing is a statement I'd like to say to the PUC.

I ask the PUC to protect the rights of landowners, those who cherish the land. Don't turn us into solely land holders who get to pay the property taxes so that a foreign company can profit.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Russell Pollak was the next speaker. And after Russell I have Katy Collier, C-O-L-L-I-E-R, from Carlton.

Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL POLLAK: You can have a copy of this already. My name is Russell Pollak.

First off, let me say that I don't oppose a new pipeline. It's going to happen. What I'm opposed to is a new route for one. The route of the existing petroleum pipeline is a better choice for all involved other than the pipeline company themselves. This established line would save many acres of private wooded areas, fields, creeks, rivers, and permanent damage to our wooded areas that are home to our wildlife.

I feel the main reason that they want to open a new southern route is to avoid the power of the Native American tribes that the existing

northern route crosses over. It is easier for the corporations to bargain with the common man who doesn't have the resources to hire lawyers to defend their rights and causes. They can take our lands by eminent domain. We have no say in it.

I have worked for 20 years on my piece of ground to make it the way I want it. I own this land, I pay taxes every year to keep this land, and I should have a right to say what is done to it.

I have a proposed alternative route that I have given maps to. It's in regards to this -- by Mahtowa. They're already on this existing petroleum line, why not stay down there instead of coming up on top of the hill and disrupting my life. The route would take the pipeline 140 yards from my front door, 300 feet from my fresh water pond. I feel this would be detrimental to the privacy I've come to enjoy.

The executives from Enbridge would be the first to complain if someone would put a pipeline through their front yard. Any rupture of that pipeline would devastate many more acres of land because of the steep drainage between here and 61, which here is my place. There are these three small tributaries that run up this hill down to Highway

61. Therefore, I feel it would be more environmentally safe to put it next to the other pipe which they're going to be running on a quarter mile anyway.

What they offer for money is in no way compensation. They don't want to deal at all. They were at my house, tried to get me to sign an easement.

And on a final note, I was wondering if Enbridge was breaking the law by buying easements. According to 216G.03, pipeline proposal, easement acquisition. Subdivision 1, compliance and penalty. Any person proposing to construct or operate a pipeline shall comply with the provisions of this section before negotiating or acquiring any easement or right-of-way agreement for that purpose. Any person who negotiates or acquires an easement without complying with the provisions of this section is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Has this pipeline been approved already or has the Commission already sided with Enbridge and they'll grant whatever route they request? It is my understanding that the PUC has not selected any official route for the pipeline as of this date.

Thank you.

MS. KATY COLLIER: Good evening. My name is Katy Collier, K-A-T-Y, C-O-L-L-I-E-R. I live in Carlton and I commend the people who are here. Talking about statutes and organic farms and all of that is wonderful. But what I ask is that you don't forget the other private landowners who may not have a certified organic farm, who may not have certified organic dairy goats, but have just lived on this land for four to five generations. Lived on it, bled for it, sweated for it, cried over it. Paid taxes to the State of Minnesota for years and years and years, and the County of Carlton.

I had an opportunity to sit with my in-laws during one of these land easement negotiations. And the gentleman who came in was very smooth. And that smoothness tended to go away after he faced any kind of opposition. And he kind of questioned and it became more of a, and I quote, this pipeline is a force of nature and it is going to happen, end quote.

Sitting at their kitchen table in their house. Speaking to them like that. And an older couple. And then plopping down a piece of paper with an amount on it, saying if you sign this within 30 days you get this amount. An incentive, he

called it. But if you don't sign, we're going to cut that value in half. And I guess this speculation for your company is this is going to go through, it's going to happen. So we can afford to speculate on easements.

But I ask you, if you don't have permission for this already, why does the value of that easement drop so much after that 30-day time frame? Why is it not worth the same amount?

MR. JOHN MCKAY: This is John McKay, manager of land services for Enbridge.

We do have an early signing bonus, as you indicated. We do have many other things that are part of the compensation package. Our intent is to amicably, you know, negotiate with the landowner, reach a settlement. I do apologize for the treatment. I would like to speak with you more about that, the agent treatment.

MS. KATY COLLIER: This is the same property that had no permission, there was no permission given, but we have cameras with Enbridge surveyor's walking on the land.

MR. JOHN MCKAY: Okay. That is not something I want to hear about.

MS. KATY COLLIER: It's a precedent.

2 3

4

5

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. JOHN MCKAY: It is my responsibility as manager and I do want to speak with you after.

> MS. KATY COLLIER: It's a precedent.

Because if that's the treatment the landowner gets prepipeline, I can't imagine the treatment they get after.

The property that they're going to go through has mature oaks, maples, blueberry patches, it's been in the family for a long time. And the initial rape of the land, and it is rape of the land 'cause there's a scar that will never heal, it will never be allowed to heal. Those trees will never come back, the land will never be used for the purpose it was intended for when these people have lived on it and loved it for generations.

It's not going to be allowed to heal. Nothing is going to come back. The privately-owned lands will never truly be the landowners' ever No houses will be built near this pipeline. again. Landowners will pay taxes to the county and state for land that's really not theirs to use in the intended purpose ever again.

And every few years, whenever Enbridge wants to, or North Dakota Pipeline, whatever you want to call yourselves, you want to hammer another

line in that the ground, you have the right to do so 1 2 without anybody saying so. And when the pipes fail, and they will 3 4 fail, the substance going through there isn't water. 5 When they fail, will you care? I don't think so. When you can fork out billions of dollars for cleanups and fines, I don't think it's going to 7 matter to you whether my water is contaminated or 8 not. Whether I can sell my property or not. You'll 9 simply pay out more blood money while we watch 10 11 generations of hard work and dreams rot under a film 12 of oil. 13 14

We ask this agency to prove me wrong in my cynicism that this is a done deal. Prove me Step up for the people who live, work, and die in the state of Minnesota.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Ryan Swanson. And after Ryan I have a card for Anne Dugan.

MR. RYAN SWANSON: Good evening. My name is Ryan Swanson, R-Y-A-N, S-W-A-N-S-O-N.

I wasn't going to speak tonight, but my mom called me today, she was pretty upset, and I felt I needed to say something.

I'm not against pipelines. I think there's a need for pipelines. But not 250 feet from

15 16

18 19

17

21

20

22

23

24 25 my mom's front door. My mom lives on County Road 5 down here, she's been there for 40 years, I grew up there. And next to her there's a power line, and in between the power line and my mom's house is where this new pipeline is proposed to go.

So, you know, my first point, I guess, is, you know, my biggest concern right now is fire danger for her. You know, this new oil that you guys are transporting, you know, it's a light crude, highly flammable oil, almost like gasoline. I've talked to a few guys that have been near it at the railroad yards and they say, you know, you're above it and it's like vapors coming at you.

And we all remember the explosion not too long ago in North Dakota. It was out in the rural area so it wasn't a big impact. But if that would have been 200 feet from my mom's house, it probably would have took the house and my neighbors', also -- or her neighbors'. Also remember back to the Quebec explosion in July of 2013, it killed 27 people, leveling a town. That just doesn't sound like a safe location for a pipeline that close to my mom's house.

Point B. You know, we know once one line is there, there's more to follow, okay. And you're

not going to go closer to the power line with a pipeline, you're going to go closer to my mom's house. So now, you know, you got to have your safe distance from the other pipeline, so now you're getting closer to her house yet, maybe even have to take her house out someday, you start talking three, four, five pipelines.

The third point I got is, you know, eventually there's going to be a leak, you know. Happening at that particular point, you know, is highly unlikely, but if it does happen, you know, that area out there is high sand and gravel country and that oil, if it leaks there, it's going to get right in the aquifer and contaminate a large area of aquifer.

So I guess in closing I'd just ask the PUC that, you know, I'd really like them to choose that north route or the Soo Line route that was talked about earlier and keep this line away from my mother's house.

Thank you.

MS. ANNE DUGAN: My name is any Anne Dugan, A-N-N-E, D-U-G-A-N, and I live in Wrenshall, Minnesota.

There are quite a few people here tonight

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

that have and will speak about why land in Carlton County is not suitable for a new oil pipeline corridor. I agree with the people that have and will speak on why a new pipeline corridor is incompatible with sustainable farming, a fast growing business in our community that supports not only local farmers but also feeds the larger region.

I agree with the people that have and will speak tonight about the importance of protecting the delicate ecosystem that feeds into our region's most precious resource, Lake Superior.

And I agree with the people who have and will speak about private property rights.

What I want to comment on tonight -COURT REPORTER: You will have to slow
down, please.

MS. ANNE DUGAN: Oh, sorry. I'm trying to go quick so I can get done. The first part is not that important.

What I want to comment on tonight dovetails with all these things, and that's the tourism and sustainable development potential in our community that I believe is incompatible with a new pipeline corridor.

I run a popular film festival in

Wrenshall, the Free Range Film Festival, and it's in its eleventh year. We get 500 people that come, many of them from outside of the area, Twin Cities, Chicago, New York, even Germany.

From 2007 to 2010 I served on the Cloquet
Tourism Board and I attended tourism conferences in
the Twin Cities put on by Explore Minnesota.

From 2006 to 2011 I served as executive director of the Carlton County Historical Society and I'm currently the curator at the Duluth Art Institute.

I list all that because in all these roles I've interacted with the tourism field and I feel there is amazing potential for ecotourism land use in Carlton County. And I would hope the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission would take a forward-thinking approach when considering land use possibilities for our area.

On Tuesday, March 11th, the New York

Times printed an article about the growing trend in residential development, where working farms become a central feature in community development. The article quotes Ed McMahon, a senior fellow for Sustainable Development at the Urban Land Institute, a nonprofit real estate research group in

Washington, D.C. I hear from developers all the time about this, they figured out that, unlike a golf course which costs millions to build and millions to maintain, they can provide green space that actually earns a profit.

Given the growth of sustainable farms in our region there is real potential for this kind of development that supports the people in the community rather than a foreign-owned company. New oil pipeline corridors restrict green building development and sustainable farming operations.

Explore Minnesota has also invested heavily in the potential for ecotourism. The organization sponsors a green gateway called Green Routes, a Minnesota directory that identifies eateries that serve locally grown food, and sites that focus on local heritage or that preserve the area's natural environment. Given the proximity of Jay Cooke State Park and explosion of organic farms, and cultural attractions such as the Free Range Film Festival and the Historic Scott House, Carlton County is a perfect candidate for this kind of tourism and the economic benefits that come with it.

The population center of Duluth would also support this potential for ecotourism and

sustainable development. Duluth Mayor Don Ness in his State of the City Address on March 4th talked about the economic potential for western neighborhoods along the St. Louis River, communities just minutes from those in our county who could benefit from this type of ecotourism land use. Ness wants to invest between \$15 million and \$18 million to help transform the far western part of the city from an industrial zone to a major tourist destination. Carlton County could easily piggyback on this potential boon, especially given the unique location of Jay Cooke State Park.

The Minnesota Public Utilities -- sorry.

These aren't pie in the sky potentials for our community's land use. I just had lunch today with an artist who is interested in setting up an artist in residence program near our farm in Wrenshall. We have a meeting next week with a representative from Washington, D.C. and farmers and artists in Madison who successfully launched similar programs. The NEA is incredibly anxious to fund this kind of program. The disruption and limiting potential of a new oil pipeline corridor through our county would make this endeavor impossible.

The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

is required to take into account current and potential land uses that could be impacted by the pipeline in the determination of a route. Please do not undermine the potential for growth of sustainable farms that can be a draw for ecotourism by establishing a new oil pipeline corridor. Please don't be shortsighted in giving away what could be true potential for our community, land use that builds community, land use that sustains community, and land use that supports community.

any of these impacts in its application and I would urge the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission to reject a new pipeline corridor. The least damaging to the land use possibilities I presented would be if Enbridge stayed within its current pipeline corridor on the northern route.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is for Sandy, S-T, I believe it's E-R-L-E.

After that I have one for Gary Peterson.

MS. SANDY STERLE: Actually, it's Sterle.

My name is Sandy Sterle, S-T-E-R-L-E. I've never

used one of these.

My husband and I own 160 acres in Blackhoof Township. This land is in our name, but

over the years I have realized we are just stewards of this precious land and water. Along with some mature trees, we have hand=planted several thousand seedlings. Nature has also filled in open spaces with cherries, plum, crabapple, high-bush cranberry and of course aspen. This is a bounty of food for large and small creatures. I listen to the sounds of chickadees, hummingbirds, owls, woodpeckers, swallows, and doves from living there. We are blessed with a very -- we were blessed with a varied thrush for a winter season. Have you seen the dance of the dragonflies in August or the hummingbird moths fighting over flowers in the front yard?

As you can see, we have quite a diversity of trees, plants, animals, and birds. The reason is we have rolling hills intermixed with a number of creeks and acres of wetlands. The middle of our land is a large basin of a string of wetlands created by beaver dams crossing from the neighbor to the east onto our land and then narrowing into our neighbor's land to the south, which drains into the Blackhoof River. I can go anywhere on our land and I know where I am. To say I love this land and its diversity doesn't express how deeply I feel about it.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So how can I show you, North Dakota Pipeline Company, that you should not be allowed to construct a new oil pipeline corridor through our And you want to go right through the middle of it in an upside-down V. This means a continuous 120-foot gap in the woods, bringing in invasive species, erosion to four creeks whose banks are made of sandy soils that would lose their support of the mature spruce, tamarack, and other trees, creating a hazardous materials corridor that would destabilize the balance between a higher elevation wetland and the pond west of our house through only being able to transverse a narrow strip. And likely spill thousands of gallons of oil because they plan to run the pipe up and down elevations through the middle of our property and then turn at what looks like a 90-degree angle on the receiving side of our big marsh that flows into the Blackhoof River and into the Nemadji watershed and into Lake Superior. Just the topography alone is not conducive to the safety of a straight pipeline.

For those of us who value living in nature, we look at the land differently. It is not about money. We understand you cannot place a price on life. A biodiverse ecosystem supported by a

unique combination of soils, water, and weather in a variety of topography sustaining a large variety of trees, et cetera, is what makes life prosper.

What is unique about our area is the people have found a way to intermix organic farming production with forest and wetland ecosystems. And we are a community close enough to towns like Cloquet and a larger city like Duluth where we can be gainfully employed or sustainably use our land to produce food and products for these population centers. Yet there is no commercial shopping centers, fast food restaurants or large industrial sites in eastern Mahtowa, Blackhoof or Wrenshall Townships. And the Carlton County Commissioners have recognized the economic value of keeping this area pristine as the potential for more organic and sustainable development.

Please, I'm asking the PUC to drop the originally proposed southern route through this area east of I-35. And, quite frankly, I don't understand why Enbridge hasn't just pulled it already.

For many families, their home and land are their largest investment that has taken the better part of their lifetime to establish or has

1 been handed down through their family. The economic 2 3 4 5 both the home and the land. 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 A local woman who worked as a Realtor 13 14 15 16 17 and property on or near a pipeline.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

impact of a new pipeline corridor, especially on land which has no utility corridors, and when it is proposed through the middle of a property, would have a significant negative impact to the value of

Not only does it create an artificial border, which NDPC will demand the right to protect, but also, as in our case, it would result in us not being able to build a road to farm the back field or log the forest beyond that if we so chose.

reported this drop in value is not only for the landowner for whom the pipeline corridor is placed, but also all the land surrounding them. And she indicated it has been harder recently to sell homes

The economic impact on private owners --

MS. TRACY SMETANA: It's five minutes.

MS. SANDY STERLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: And after

Mr. Peterson, I have a card for Craig Sterle, S-T-E-R-L-E.

MR. GARY PETERSON: Hello. My name is Gary Peterson, P-E-T-E-R-S-O-N. And I know there's

l

been a lot of good comments and information tonight so I'll be brief.

I am a county commissioner representing district five. I grew up in Mahtowa.

If this pipeline is going to come through Carlton County, my position would be for it to stay on existing corridors. This could start with the first option being the northern route, the second option being the Soo Line, the third option other power or pipelines.

It seems to me that Enbridge's first choice is to follow the power line from western Carlton County to Mahtowa, then go off the power line, cross the Moose Horn River, cross an existing pipeline, cross Highway 61, and enter into virgin territory.

I travel Highway 61 all the time. And I see no reason why Enbridge can't stay on the west side of Highway 61 and follow the adjacent pipeline which will later reconnect with the power line they started with. I have hunted that area and I don't see wetlands as a concern. You know, this would avoid issues with property owners in the virgin territory.

Please consider these alternatives and I

hope you will listen and work with all of thelandowners of Carlton County.

Thank you.

MR. CRAIG STERLE: Good evening. My name is Craig Sterle, a graduate forester from the University of Minnesota, recently retired from the Minnesota DNR as the assistant area supervisor in Cloquet. I'm going to talk specifically about the routes themselves, taking the information from the document.

It appears that the northern route was largely rejected because North Dakota Pipeline Company is unable to use eminent domain on tribal, federal, state and county land to acquire their right-of-way, in particular citing an inability on Leech Lake and Fond du Lac reservation lands. As project planning progresses -- this a quote. As project planning progresses, it became apparent North Dakota Pipeline Company would not have been able to assemble a continuous right-of-way for significant portions of the northern route. This explanation -- unquote. This explanation lacks detail. It is unclear from the document if North Dakota Pipeline Company ever had any recent formal contact or negotiations with the tribes located on

the northern route. It would seem that North Dakota Pipeline Company needs to contact and return to the bargaining table with tribes to reach a fair settlement.

North Dakota Pipeline Company appears unwilling to bargain in good faith, pay fair compensation should not be a reason -- not paying fair compensation should not be a reason to reject the best possible route. Therefore, the Public Utilities Commission must reject the premise and require North Dakota Pipeline Company to return to the negotiating table with the tribes to reach an equitable financial solution that will allow construction on the northern route.

If North Dakota Pipeline Company and the tribes cannot reach an agreement of their own, I suggest that the PUC ask a state mediator to be brought in to facilitate an agreement, possibly through binding arbitration.

North Dakota Pipeline Company's preferred route will pass through and impact the White Earth Reservation, so all of the alternatives will have direct impacts on the tribes. However, an entirely new corridor will have less -- excuse me -- far greater impacts than adding one pipe in the existing

right-of-way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

After citing several advantages to the northern route, all of which should be weighed and thoroughly considered against negative impacts, North Dakota Pipeline Company lists several disadvantages. One, the route crosses 7.8 miles of additional wetlands. In shedding some light on this, the wetlands along the northern route are already heavily impacted by the existence of six other Enbridge industrial pipeline developments. And further impacts as a result of another pipeline installation done with due caution will have far less impact on the environment than putting the same pipeline in a comparatively pristine environment of the preferred route. One additional pipeline in the present corridor will have far fewer social and environmental consequences than the proliferation of an all new right-of-way.

Therefore, the Public Utilities

Commission must reject this argument by North Dakota

Pipeline Company that this route will negatively

impact the wetlands along the northern route to a

greater extent than the preferred route, and require

North Dakota Pipeline Company to utilize their

existing main line right-of-way, the northern route

1 alternative.

In viewing the comparison data on Table 2.3.3-1, the northern route is shorter by 43 miles; utilizes more right-of-way, existing right-of-way, 12 miles more; impacts far fewer miles of green field, 55 miles less; impacts 62 fewer wetlands; fewer miles of highly erodible soil, 57 miles of highly erodible soil, 57 miles of highly erodible soil; and fewer miles of prime farmland, 16 miles of fewer -- of prime farmland. It also provides better access, having 19 more road crossing points and more railroad crossing points for improved access. Using some basic math calculations, this route impacts about 623 fewer acres or almost one square mile.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Excuse me, sir. That's five minutes.

MR. CRAIG STERLE: Okay. One square mile of additional undisturbed land.

Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is Janaki Fisher-Merritt, and after that it's Kristie Laveau.

MR. JANAKI FISHER-MERRITT: Hi, Janet.

COURT REPORTER: Hi.

MR. JANAKI FISHER-MERRITT: My name is

Janaki Fisher-Merritt. J-A-N-A-K-I, F-I-S-H-E-R - M-E-R-R-I-T-T.

I'm afraid a lot of what I'm going to say has already been covered a little bit, so I'll really just try to hit the high points.

I live and farm in Wrenshall Township.

Food, community, and responsible stewardship have been a focus of my past two decades, being directly involved in our family's farm. My wife and I purchased the farm in 2010 and we've been really thrilled to be joined by a lot of new farmers whose produce graces dinner tables each night in the Duluth area. And I'm very proud to be part of an active network of existing farmers that are supportive and welcoming to new sustainable farming.

What we do isn't -- wouldn't only be endangered by a pipeline if it just crossed our land, we're also very dependent on the responsible land stewards that surround us, as are other potential sustainable farming operations. There's been a lot of work done in our area by the Carlton County Soil and Water Conservation District, the University of Minnesota Extension Service, to support responsible land use. And all of that, the benefits to water quality and habitat biodiversity

benefits organic farmers because we depend on those surrounding healthy plant and animal communities to provide other ecosystem services to control pests and insects and other diseases on our farm. So we're very much dependent on responsible land stewardship by other people in the community. And industrial development of pipelines really endangers that.

Production of fresh market organic vegetables is very demanding of top quality soils and it's extremely sensitive to degradation of soil health from pipeline construction. And especially reliant on stable, high-quality surroundings to encourage beneficial insects and birds through our advocacy work with the Land Stewardship Project, the Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Service, Center for World Affairs, Sustainable Farming Association and other groups.

I'm part of a wide network of farmers throughout the upper Midwest, and to my knowledge there's no successful organic vegetable operation that farms over an oil pipeline.

I'm going to skip some of this here just because it's been said already.

But as far as I can tell, the applicant's

2 3 4

environmental information report makes no mention of sustainable agriculture or any of these other current or future land use impacts. It says that it contains a detailed description of natural resources, but really it doesn't. It simply lists animals that typically would live in agricultural, wooded or wetland areas.

For all the time their survey crews spent in our area, I'm really surprised at the lack of specificity contained in the application. It basically makes no distinction between the western part of the state, the central part of the state and our part of the state, let alone the varying areas and different areas of biodiversity within those particular areas.

And this is despite all the information provided by myself and Carlton County Land Stewards and others about the cultural, economic, social impacts of pipeline construction and how that would impact us in particular or people who are close by.

So that having been said, I support the current preferred route as a significant improvement over the alternative. It's a better option.

However, I believe the route most in keeping with the principle of nonproliferation and the least

__

damaging to natural resources is the northern route alongside Enbridge's main line system. However, I would ask that the PUC strongly consider the no action alternative.

It's unclear to me whether there's a comprehensive plan for transporting oil out of the Bakken shale or the Alberta tar sands with well over a million barrels per day of increased capacity being requested by Enbridge just in the last couple of years, and a lot more production forecast to be coming from these regions. We need a bigger picture view of this issue to be able to properly balance the environmental conservation and landowner rights and crude oil transport.

Minnesota State statute calls for 15

percent reduction in fossil fuel use by 2015, and 25

percent of our energy coming from renewables by

2025. Minnesotans should be rewarded for their

ongoing efforts to conserve energy and produce more

renewables rather than compromising our own precious

natural resources so others can continue to consume.

The no action alternative --

MS. TRACY SMETANA: That's five minutes.

MR. JANAKI FISHER-MERRITT: This is my last sentence.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Thank you.

MR. JANAKI FISHER-MERRITT: The no action alternative may not meet Enbridge's project objectives, but it may be in the best interest of the people of Minnesota.

Thank you.

MS. KRISTIE LAVEAU: Hello. After those really long ones, I got a really short one.

My name is Kristie Laveau, K-R-I-S-T-I-E, L-A-V-E-A-U. And I live in Wrenshall.

I have lots of concerns about this new pipeline and, of course, you're hearing a lot of them tonight. And we all share the same concerns and fears.

I know there's been a change in the route to stay on the main line corridor from Wisconsin to I-35, and that's great for me 'cause that's where I live. However, I don't feel the change is set in stone until the PUC says it is. I have to assume that I'm still under the gun and I still have to deal with the pipeline.

With that being said, I'm totally against the entire southern route since it includes my home, many acres of undisturbed land, and runs too close to our very popular Itasca State Park. My land

already has a gas line running through it and I feel that your option of being able to use existing right-of-ways is wrong and misleading. You're not using that existing right-of-way. You're taking more land next to it and opening up a wider spot. This would cause me to lose hundreds of mature hardwood trees that help stop the erosion that takes place.

We have been able to work with the Soil and Water Conservation group to stop erosion on our place since we are in the Nemadji watershed zone and Lake Superior water basin. Any disturbance to land will make our project worthless.

Our great state of 10,000 lakes needs to take a stand and stand behind the people who live here, play here, and enjoy our great outdoors. You can't enjoy nature once it has been dug up, spilled on, or dying. Minnesota needs to understand that we will always be in the path of oil lines crossing the state to get to refineries or ships. We need to make sure that those lines all run together and that we follow the nonproliferation status. The more places you put pipelines, the more places you will have environmental disasters.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is for a Karola Dalen. And after that I have one for Don O'Connor.

MS. KAROLA DALEN: Karola Dalen.
K-A-R-O-L-A, D-A-L-E-N.

My name is Karola and my family resides in Wrenshall Township. We run an organic vegetable farm on 33 acres. This summer will be our tenth season. The farm is our livelihood.

The food we grow goes to over 150 local families and we plan to provide more into the future. The farm is thriving.

We have two children, ages two and four, who will attend Wrenshall public schools someday.

The reason we moved to Carlton County was for the opportunity to farm, the valuable farmland itself, and the supportive community around it. We would like to be here for the rest of our lives.

Two young men work for us, one which recently acquired 40 acres across the street from our farm. He and his wife are expecting their first child this summer. They would like to be there for the rest of their lives. There are many more people like us.

The food producing farmland in this

_ _

county is more valuable than I can even fathom to explain in this statement. Food prices will continue to rise as energy prices continue to rise. Our local food producing capabilities are priceless for the future.

A pipeline crossing a field interrupts cultivating, cropping, and drainage patterns. Due to extreme soil disturbance and compaction, the area where a pipeline is installed is destroyed from any significant food production. The entire pipeline right-of-way is not farmable. The soil health and vitality is a carefully managed practice of crop rotation, green manures, and added nutrients and minerals and takes years for real improvement. This investment of sustainable soil management is not possible on soil the pipeline company controls. Therefore, it is also destroyed from any significant food production.

Keep the pipeline away from organic farms and away from undisturbed farmland in Carlton County. The proposed route should entirely follow existing pipeline corridors. The proposed route along existing power lines would result in a greater impact to farmlands, wetlands, forest lands, and wildlife habitat, compared to utilizing the existing

pipeline corridor.

This statement is for myself and in support of the Carlton County Land Stewards.

Farmlands, forests, and water, if protected and managed correctly, are renewable resources. The oil from North Dakota and other places is temporary.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: And after

Mr. O'Connor I have a card for a Randall Hanson,

Randy Hanson.

MR. DON O'CONNOR: Ready, Janet?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.

MR. DON O'CONNOR: My name is Don O'Connor, O, apostrophe, C-O-N-N-O-R. I live in Carlton, but I really don't have any skin in the game. The pipeline doesn't affect my property, but I wanted to speak because I've sat here and listened to 26 other people talk about how it does affect them.

I just want to talk a little bit about both professionally and personally. Professionally I'm the executive director of the Duluth Builders Exchange. We are a trade association of 400 members in the construction industry. We've got quite a bit of experience with Enbridge Energy. And I would

have to say that their safety record of 99.999

percent is accurate, and our satisfaction rating

among contractors with them is also 99.999 percent.

So as I listen to all of you people, I just want to impart a little bit of my experience with them. I have several friends who work for Enbridge, who do a good job for Enbridge, who truly are concerned about being environmentally responsible, socially responsible, and concerned with the impact they do have on the public and private landowners.

As I came in, I saw a lot of stickers that say More Cowbells, Less Pipeline. I truly believe that the PUC and Enbridge would like to see more cowbell and more pipeline, and I think with your comments and suggestions tonight, that's a doable process.

Thank you.

MR. RANDY HANSON: Thank you. My name is Randy Hanson, and I teach about sustainable food systems and natural resources and related courses in the program in environmental sustainability at the University of Minnesota - Duluth.

I also started something called the Sustainable Agriculture Project at UMD's field and

research study center. And this was in 2009 really to respond to this explosion in interest among young people to figure out a pathway forward to a more sustainable world. Where, you know, we see ourselves sort of stuck between a race for what's left, search for the more dirty, unconventional sources of natural resources, versus looking for livelihoods and ways that we can build for our young people that create a more sustainable future in ways that don't undermine our natural systems.

And so I do a lot of work looking at regional food systems, which are really growing faster not only in the western Lake Superior region here, but all around the country as a promising sector for this and a pathway for young people.

And, you know, we've had an amazing history of regional food production in earlier times, and there's a sort of renaissance right now happening, an explosion. And it's really exciting to kind of watch these young people sort of catch wind with this sustainable work.

And in all of this they look towards

Carlton County as the kind of center, because of all
the incredible work that's going on. And not just
in sustainable organic food systems, but for the

2

3

4

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

kind of broader integration of forestry and land care and land management and responsible stewardship.

And, you know, I have a lot -- I wrote down a lot of things to say, but I guess what I really want to say, and skipping all of that, is that, you know, I think what's happening here in Carlton County is an under -- or not really well understood how amazing it is. And it's getting a lot more attention for how to reconstruct communities and how to provide pathways for young people to have livelihoods and live within functioning, healthy communities.

And, you know, farmers here and the people who have lived here a long time are not just I think they're really teachers, they're mentors for a pathway forward in creating a more sustainable world. And I know from personal experience, you know, at least a dozen young people who have interned on these organic farms and then now are in search of ways to create their own farms to respond to the upswing in interest in local organic foods.

And so in all of this, you know, this pipeline sort of proposal, coming in on the south

route really stands in stark contrast to this amazing renaissance that's happening in Carlton County. And, you know, I really just want to say that the -- that the principle of nonproliferation should be respected and should be given great weight in this process.

And I understand that there are challenges in the north route, but Enbridge is a powerful company that can meet challenges. And I think that, you know, it is in the public good to stay in those existing routes and work with landowners in this region as they help build a sustainable pathway to a better future.

That's all I want to say. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
I have is for Mark Thell, T-H-E-L-L. After
Mr. Thell I have a Mr. Mike Hyland.

MR. MARK THELL: Mark, M-A-R-K, Thell, T-H-E-L-L. It's simply hell with a T in front of it, is what my dad would say. I had to throw that in there because it's been a little dry for you guys sitting up there.

But I like to tell stories. For my story
I would start with this scenario 'cause we've been
talking about farming so much. The farmer is

plowing his fields and he happens to plow up this bottle and he opens it and, sure enough, the genie pops out. And so the genie gives him this big hug and he says, I've been in this bottle for over 100 years, I'm so happy to get out of here. And what he says, I'll grant you any wish, but whatever I give you I want to give to you twice to your neighbor. So the old farmer, he thought and he thought, and he says, well, what am I going to do here? He says, okay, I decided. Take out one of my eyes. Kind of crude, but I think that summarizes a lot of my neighbors out here of what is asked of them to give up their property.

We have farmed, we have built lands, and I think there's another solution out here, that the PUC should definitely stop permitting pipelines. You're giving them, granting them unfair competition. We have rail lines. Dan talked about the Soo Line. We can put the tracks back on there, we can haul that oil on that rail. And when that oil is on that rail, my wife has a saying, out of sight, out of mind. The pipelines are buried. That's true. We don't realize what we do in society when we bury something. But when we watch those trains go by, we know exactly what we're doing.

2

3

5

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We all use oil. The more that we realize what we do to this society, the more sustainability that we can pass on to our children. And what I mean about the commerce clause of that is we are the private landowners that this oil is run through our There's 11 lines on my parents' original farm, that's natural gas, crude oil, and the effluent that goes from Chicago back up to the tar sands through there. There has never been nothing -- on some of those there was a \$50 easement paid to the property owner at that time that went in. about 1950. That's not fair that those lands are giving up the value, and there's no compensation for that, for those existing landowners where those corridors are. They should be compensated and that would create the same advantage.

The railroads own their land, they pay taxes. We could put them lines back on the Soo Line and run those rail cars. And from what I understand, those rail cars are made up in Canada, they are not pipes that are made in China, so we would be creating a lot more American jobs by using the rail lines.

And I'm very happy with you guys that you have that strong of a safety record, that's

1 impressive, because I understand what happens when the lands start shifting around. So that's kind of 2 where I'm at, is there's a congress behind this and 3 4 our society needs to look at the bigger issue. 5 do have issues with oil in our society and we should really look at it as a big picture and not just simply a one-time, put a pipeline in and that'll 7 solve an energy problem, because it just adds more 8 cost to the next generation down that they won't 9 10 have natural resources to profit from. 11 So thank you. 12 MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: I think I'm last. 13 Am I last? 14 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Six more. 15 MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: I'm going to make 16 this fairly quick. My name is Michael, 17 M-I-C-H-A-E-L, Hyland, H-Y-L-A-N-D. 18 I'm the current mayor of the City of 19 Wrenshall, I've been mayor for 24 years. In that 20 time period I have seen lines, oil lines, gas lines, 21 come through our area. 22 Just in the last six months, we completed 23 a wellhead study, which has to be completed every 24 It's been submitted to the State Health ten vears. 25 Department at this time, it was done for rural

2

4

5

3

_

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

water. We put extensive research into that. We have two wells in the city of Wrenshall. Our newest well is 517 feet deep, they believe that we're drinking ice age water, some of the best quality water in the country. Our secondary well is 154 feet deep and, quite obviously, our secondary well is more susceptible to any kind of spill.

Now, I want everybody here to know that I support business. But I also support all these wonderful people behind me that are in our surrounding communities. Our well right now feeds, on any school day, over 1,000 people every day, So that line is in what's called our WSMA, our WSMA is our watershed, okay. And that's where your lines run to the west of us. That could have But I would rather see you come potential impact. through that existing easement where we already have lines than affect all of these people. Because these people feed our city. Without them, we have low economy, we have no school district. Carlton County would lose tax base.

So my questions are, in the deals with our fire department we have 28 volunteers. My first question is, closest hazmat team to get to an existing fire and/or spill, where is it?

1 MR. JOHN PECHIN: I'll just speak up loud John Pechin. It would be Superior. 2 enough. MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: 3 Okay. And response 4 time? 5 MR. JOHN PECHIN: I'll say an hour before 6 the first man gets here. MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: About an hour. 7 So based upon the 360,000 gallons per day, okay. 8 MR. JOHN PECHIN: Barrels. 9 10 MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: Or barrels, okay, 11 we'd lose about 30, 40,000 gallons on the ground in 12 an hour. Not counting setup time, et cetera, 13 probably a couple hours. 14 MR. ART HASKINS: My name is Art Haskins, 15 I'm the emergency response coordinator. 16 That's not correct. You don't have to 17 wait for a hazmat team to be able to respond. Regular firefighters, law enforcement, and ambulance 18 19 are all -- can take the training, it's the DOT 20 guidebook that in isolated areas are well published, 21 and that training is available online for free, as well as our company response and our contractor 22 23 response. So we would not have to wait for the 24 hazmat team. And the lines themselves can be 25 remotely closed, the block valves, to limit the

Okay. How about the

Okay. My follow-up

Once again, our

1

2

release amount. So it's not dependent on the arrival of the hazmat team to control that.

MR. MICHAEL HYLAND:

3

equipment to stop the spread of oil?

MR. ART HASKINS:

5

6

4

company, Enbridge, we own the majority of the equipment that would be used to control the spread

7 8

of oil, as well as to start the recovery process.

9

Along with our contractors, our oil spill recovery

10

organizations that we work with, those would be the

11

equipment that would be used to control as well as

12

recover the product.

13

MR. MICHAEL HYLAND: question is, there have been online sessions, okay,

14 15

which our firemen have taken and reported, you know,

16

followed through with. But have there been actual

17

hands-on meetings with Cloquet Fire Department,

18

Esko, Wrenshall, Blackhoof? Our fire department

19

personally, we cover from Wrenshall to Wisconsin

20

border, west to 103, south as far as Holyoke and

21

Clear Creek. A huge fire area. I've just -- I

22

would love to see more hands-on training, okay.

23

And eventually something is going to

24

We don't have these meetings and we get all happen.

25

these people up in arms, okay. And I'm saying if

1	you're going to use a route, do what Mark said, rail
2	it, use the Soo Line, or use the existing, okay.
3	Because right now you have a lot of people up in
4	arms, which I think is highly unnecessary and wrong.
5	But I do support business. That's what
6	makes us tick.
7	Thank you.
8	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Our court reporter
9	needs a break. So, Janet, how much time do you
10	need?
11	COURT REPORTER: Ten minutes.
12	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Ten minutes. So at
13	Janet's direction we will reconvene in ten minutes.
14	And I have, I believe, five speaker cards left.
15	(Break taken from 9:26 to 9:39.)
16	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: We would like to
17	reconvene. The next speaker card I have is for a,
18	excuse me, Rita Vavrosky. Did I pronounce that
19	correctly?
20	MS. RITA VAVROSKY: Do I hold this?
21	MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Only if you want to.
22	MS. RITA VAVROSKY: Can you hear me okay?
23	My name is Rita Vavrosky, that's spelled
24	V, as in victory, A, another V, R-O-S-K-Y.
25	According to the numbers reported in the

route application filed by North Dakota Pipeline
Company, a large percentage, some 75 percent of the
land on the revised preferred route is privately
owned by people, by citizens of Minnesota. I don't
know all their stories, but you can be sure they
each have one. We've heard several of them tonight.
You get to hear another one. You're going to hear a
lot of bedtime stories tonight. I'm going to be
here as a representative of those stories, telling
you the story of Spectrum Farm.

Nearly two decades ago, my husband Steve and I sat on a couch in a house in North Minneapolis talking about how we wanted to do our part to change the world. That conversation ended in a decision to leave the city, to live a sustainable life and begin a long chapter we are living right now called Spectrum Farm.

For five years, we researched and learned, we attended seminars and read voraciously, we studied renewable energy and pressure canning and building techniques. We learned all we could about growing food and caring for animals as we began our search for land.

Over time, we determined a strict set of criteria for our little piece of the earth. We

needed the appropriate setup for renewable energy, microhydro, or wind or solar. Not oil. We needed pasture and garden land as well as forest land for maple sap and furnace fuel. We refused to either look at any piece of land that was on or near a transformer station, a high-voltage power line, or a pipeline.

After five years and three moves, we came to where we are now in the middle of Carlton County. We had looked at more than 300 pieces of land and we believe we found the most perfect one for our vision. During that search, we honed our mission statement, which is to produce good things for people in a way that doesn't destroy the natural ecological balance, and then to share those things. It worked. That process of deliberate decision-making worked.

For the past 12 years, Steve and I, with our six children learning and working by our side, has made that mission happen. Our solar panels now produce all the energy our farm requires and the excess goes to our neighbors. The orchard we started as soon as we moved in is now bearing wonderful apples. Our garden provides much of the food that we eat. We raise chickens and cows, pigs

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and sheep, we make hay. When our pantry is full we sell the extra to folks who value local, sustainably raised food. Sometimes it's the neighbor next door with whom we trade beans or tomatoes. Throughout the summer we take things to the Mahtowa farmers market to sell and trade. We have a pleasantly long list of regular buyers for our custom-cut pork, our eggs, and our hay. You may have seen our eggs at the Whole Foods Co-op or watched us hand-milk our cows at the Carlton County Fair.

People visit our farm all the time. They come from the city to see animals up close and to try milking a cow. They come to help throw hay bales or stack wood. They build fences, press cider, and extract honey. People come to tour the farm to learn how to can, to talk about the philosophy of sustainability.

They drive up the driveway just to ask about the alpacas and the solar panels. We've had workers from Germany, France, and China, as well as many places in the U.S.A. That is all part of our sharing mission.

In the spring, this week, Steve will tap the maple trees. We happen to have a bit of a disagreement about just how many taps he gets to put

in, but now that our syrup is certified organic, I guess he gets to tap as many trees as he wants to. First he determines who is eligible that year. The trees can't be too young or too old. If they've sustained an injury or just look like they need a year off, they get the time they need to become strong again. Our lives are governed by the sap runs as we gather the sap and bring it back on sleds, pulled by ponies. Around the fire we boil and boil and boil that sap until it becomes syrup. It's a couple of weeks of bonfire parties with visitors coming and going and lots of sticky treats.

The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission has in front of it at this time a proposal to route a crude oil pipeline through the Spectrum Farm forest. If it is approved, Enbridge Energy will hire contractors to cut down a 120-foot swath of oak, maple, aspen, birch, spruce and pine trees. Fifty of those feet will be predominately trailed, the other 70 feet will be allowed to grow again, for the moment at least.

But a maple tree has to be 45 years old before we can tap it. That means that even if we get out there and plant seedlings that next spring, and even if the pipeline company doesn't come back

1 in five years to run another pipeline, or next year with line 3, I won't live long enough to tap those 2 3 trees. 4 Other landowners along this route have 5 made careful decisions too. Some value their land 6 for hunting and recreation. My neighbors, they resent being told how their land will be managed. 7 Some watch the birds and other wildlife and fear for 8 9 the safety of the species they strive to protect. 10 Most of us care about water quality and understand 11 the delicate relationship between the land and the 12 water. Each steward of the land has reasons why --13 MS. TRACY SMETANA: Five minutes. 14 MS. RITA VAVROSKY: Can I wrap up 15 quickly? 16 Of why a petroleum pipeline is 17 incompatible with his or her land. 18 So please, PUC, protect the interests of 19 the people on the land, not the bottom lines of the 20 corporations masquerading as people. 21 Insist upon considerate interactions 22 between all applicants, including their contracted 23 employees, with landowners and penalize the 24 applicants who disregard this important step.

if significant local public, not corporate need is

found for this or any new pipeline to cross our state, please locate them all together in the corridor that already exists.

Thank you very much.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is for Eric, is it Fosland? Forland. After that I have a card for Carol Anderson.

MR. ERIC FORLAND: Thank you, guys, for sitting through this long day, and I guess you're probably getting tired of this.

My name is Eric Forland, F-0-R-L-A-N-D. I live out in the western half of Carlton County, pretty close to the border there.

My property will be directly affected by the southern project, the southern route of this project in the following ways. The current proposal would have the route run directly through the center of my property from the east to the west. The pipe would be located approximately 200 feet from my house. The pipe would run through a family gravel pit on the eastern edge of the property. We use this gravel pit, my family has used this gravel pit for as long as we've owned the property, to improve our property. We try to use the materials from this gravel pit any time we do any improvements on the

property to try and eliminate any foreign materials coming in or off of the property. This pipeline will cross the west branch of the Kettle River and an unnamed stream that's basically a drainage tributary for one of the bogs out behind our property. The route takes the pipeline through -- currently through our hayfields and our pastures. It crosses fences and livestock facilities as it does that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition to the directly affected aspects of this pipeline, the pipeline would have the -- would also affect our farm in the following We have been operating a small, nonprofit organization named Homeland Ranch for the past few We have been using horses in a mentorship vears. and teaching role to provide a safe and creative place for people to work on the struggles in their We've been working towards the goal of developing an alternative treatment environment to those struggling with dependency and behavioral In general, this program will be issues. incorporating equine-assisted therapy, or EAP, with the hands-on skills of running an organic, self-sustaining farm. Our long-term goal is to provide essential housing and transportation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assistance for those with more in-depth needs.

The proposed pipeline project would affect our ability to obtain or maintain our organic certification, which we're hoping to have in place this year. This farm has been in the family for the last 40 years and was a dairy farm for the first 20 This is where I was born and raised. Ι vears. purchased the farm from my dad in '97 when I was in the service, so it's where I grew up, it's where I live.

I consider the land that we farm as being prime farmland. And as it would be defined by the Code of Federal Regulations 1980, title 7, section You know, the code that basically generally 657.5. defines prime farmland. As I read through the paragraphs of that section, it fits our land pretty specifically.

If we weren't able to complete the organic certification for the farmland, it would put our -- the products that we market and grow through our greenhouses and the land would have a pretty steep disadvantage. This route would also limit the future plans that we'd have for the buildings -- or for the property that would include but not be limited to the building of greenhouses, the planting

2

3

4

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of trees, to building permanent livestock It would also limit our ability to plan facilities. our housing and cultural areas and the use of heat pump ground loops in this area.

This pipeline -- the pipeline would decrease property values, obviously, everybody has been talking about that so we're all very familiar with that. My family and guests would also be, because of the close proximity of the line, would be exposed to the well-documented risk associated with living in close proximity to this pipeline.

North Dakota Pipeline Company hasn't given us any guarantee that there will never be a faultage, and that's been talked about tonight as This leads the landowners to assume the well. immediate risks. I was a little bit taken aback by the response given as far as emergency response. guess I had assumed, up until tonight, that there would be a quicker response or more timely response in emergencies. And we're on the eastern half of the county, so an hour to respond to here, in my mind, it seems like two hours to respond to me out on the western half. That's a little bit alarming to me, in addition to everything else.

In general, I'm asking that the PUC deny

the proposed southern route and keep the existing route of the corridor that's already used. The establishment of multiple pipelines running through this current corridor shows the northern route is a feasible and prudent alternative to the proposed southern route.

From Enbridge's website, their plans to upgrade the lines that exist on this route already on the northern route would be in keeping with the following statutes, as well as protecting the --

MS. TRACY SMETANA: It's five minutes.

MR. ERIC FORLAND: Well, thank you for your time. The statute that I wanted to bring up in keeping with was the National Environmental Protection Act, 1968, 42, which prohibits the taking of additional farmland if there's a prudent alternative, and I believe that the northern route is a prudent alternative to the southern route.

Thank you.

MS. CAROL ANDERSON: My name is Carol Anderson, C-A-R-O-L, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.

Forty years ago my husband convinced me to live in the country. I was not going to live in the country by any means. However, once we moved out here, you cannot get me back into town. We have

80 acres in Wrenshall. There are all kinds of animals, birds, a variety of trees on our property. The 40 acres north of County Road 4, we have five pipelines going through it right now. If Enbridge comes through this will be number six. What can you do with 40 acres with six pipelines on it?

I talked to the county assessor one time and I said how could I sell this property? He said somebody would put a hunting shack on it. I said would you? He said no. My husband planted over 1,000 trees on those same 40 acres. One of the pipelines came through and cut down every single tree. Those of you who have planted trees know that you do not plant trees for yourself, you plant them for future generations, which I get told all the time.

So I'm hoping that we do not -- you do not allow this pipeline to go through. I do not want another pipeline going through my property which will eventually belong to my children and my grandchildren.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card I have is Phyllis Lehti, if I pronounced it correctly.

MS. PHYLLIS LEHTI: Pretty close. Pretty

1 close.

My name is Phyllis Lehti and I live on County Road 4 in Eagle Township. P-H-Y-L-L-I-S, Lehti, L-E-H-T-I. I'm one of the lucky people because it doesn't come onto our land, it's across the road. Believe me, we don't feel safe.

I don't know if you guys have ever made hay, but when you're making hay you just stick with the job until it's all done. It's kind of like making hay tonight.

I've been a dairy farmer up here in the days when a dairy farm was a little more predominant than it is now. My husband and I have had a couple cows we milked by hand, and in later years some beef cattle. But mostly what you're seeing here is a real picture of what Minnesota is like up here. There's Minnesota nice, and these people, all of us, we will ask you to our table, we will give you coffee, we will say is there anything we can get you? But don't trifle, don't ever condescend or assume that these people don't have a backbone because, boy, they do.

Well, anyway, I grew up on number 4.

When you grow up on a farm it's different than
farming it yourself. When you farm yourself you

learn to love things like soil, like these people have been telling you. The place where I live, we have 120 acres. Twenty acres of it is not usable because in 1962 a company came through and said, you know what, we need your gravel, and we'll put everything back just like it was. We haven't been able to use the land since because they didn't. They weren't a big Enbridge entity, but that's when I learned to be real careful with who you deal with.

The Kettle River crosses number 4 just down the road. Swam in there as a kid, there was some fish in there. There are still some turtles. And most of the local people say it hasn't been the same since the peat plant started dumping their effluence into Kettle Lake, which goes into Kettle River. The Kettle River goes into the St. Croix River which goes into the Mississippi River. In 1965 the Kettle was designated by LBJ as a wild and scenic river, and I thought it would be safe.

My 16-year-old nephew said to me tonight, but Phyllis, if they put a pipeline under the river, what if it leaks? And he said, but Phyllis, if that pipeline goes to Superior, it's going to go under some more rivers. And I said, yeah. And I think about my neighbor about five miles west of the

- -

Mahtowa and its designated trout stream, well, that's something there too. And, you know what, it doesn't affect me, but it affects my neighborhood, it affects all these people that live up here.

And, you know, I think I try to trust you, we all need oil. And then I hear about this Kalamazoo thing. And I say, well, what I would say, basically, is, you know, these people can be Minnesota nice, but like Dan Reed said, if there's nobody to monitor it, man, that oil comes out so fast. 375 million barrels per day -- thousand, excuse me. It translates to big numbers. Nobody to monitor it.

I would just say whatever you do in Minnesota you might be wiser to go with your routes that are already there than try to take on some more of this stuff. Don't trifle with these people 'cause this ain't Kalamazoo.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: That was the last speaker card that I had. In closing, I guess I'd like to do two things. I see a young gentleman over there with a necktie on and a blue shirt. Would you like to say anything or ask a question of anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED: Are you talking to me?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Well, you're kind of

listening, maybe you have an opinion you'd like to share? You don't have to. I just thought if you wanted to I'd give you the opportunity. So why don't you think about it, perhaps, while I wrap up a few things.

Michael, did you want to say anything?
Keep it brief. Thank you for your patience.

MR. MICHAEL DAHL: Thank you for yours. (Speaking in Ojibwe.)

These guys are pretty damn close to understanding that after seven meetings with them.

Okay. We've gotten -- you know, we've gotten to the point over the last week and a half that I believe we have sincere smiles, and nice to see each other, that we make it home safely.

Because over the last week and a half, a couple different things that I want to say.

What I was saying there is this is kind of a bittersweet closing of this tour for me because this is where I riced for the very first time, was just right over here. My brother took me out, Tom Hawes. Maybe some of you recognize his name, director of DNR here in Fond du Lac. That's my brother. And he took me out ricing for the very first time right over here just a few years ago.

Over the last week here, listening to everybody, the highlight that I see as the commonality between both indigenous and nonindegenous people of these areas, we're concerned about the land, the soil, the farming, the environment, the organic, which we've done for thousands of years. We've always been organic. And now the title comes along, and it's nice to have that shared interest.

The endangered species, some of which, there again, in talking to Lorraine over the last week and a half, the goal has been achieved. I learned. And informative question-and-answer sessions and I learned. It hasn't changed my opinion, but I learned.

Some of the things that I'd like to ask of the PUC on record again is changing the length of time. This is not enough time to make comments, to understand. The young lady that stood up that said I didn't know, I didn't know about Enbridge until I got a letter.

The people in Park Rapids that are snowbirds, we heard that the other day, so many of them have left in November, the announcement comes December, PUC decision January 31st, comment period

closes April 4th. Those people will not be back to comment on their own and really be able to understand and be a part of these community meetings. Extending this comment period and making more access, accessibility for the common people. Adding more places. You know, you saw, we got to Park Rapids. As I said, Park Rapids is closer to our reserve, White Earth Reserve, more people came out. Some of the White Earth people came to East Lake, or McGregor, because that is the original place of my family. That's why I went to McGregor as well. That's where my family originated, from Sandy Lake and Gull Lake Reserve area, East Lake.

The time is an issue. The time is an issue, I understand the tour and everything of the sort, but as I noted, the evening sessions are by far more well attended. 11:00 to 2:00 in the afternoon, we saw where some people came during their lunch break but had to leave. Larry, we saw that in Park Rapids. People had to leave because they had appointments, they had things to do. Maybe they had children to pick up. Even Tracy felt that when she had to skip, had to miss one meeting. And I've got to give credit where credit is due, Tracy left one meeting because her daughter had a band

concert last week. This is how much time we spent together.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: That's true.

MR. MICHAEL DAHL: The questions on the request that I have after hearing all of this is I really feel that the community along the whole route has repeatedly demanded and asked for a real, true environmental impact statement. A full one. Not a comparative analysis, but an environmental impact statement to really research all these endangered species, all these things along the route, to look at these things.

The lady in McGregor today said we have to pass all these tests within our county before we can even put our septic tank in and that's not biohazard. That's just plain old crap. That will -- you know, it's not going to bother us. We can't put our septic system through in a wetland. If we have a bog in our back yard that we purchased we can't put a septic there. Why would we consider putting a pipeline through that?

The name change, as we've noted, is a real confusing thing for people.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: That's your five minutes.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MICHAEL DAHL: Okay. Name change, Enbridge, maybe start putting them together so people understand it is the same entity.

Double walling, casing of the pipes.

It was brought to my attention, Mike, unless you rode a horse here. You know, I did. rode from Superior, Wisconsin all the way to Grand Forks -- or to Leonard, to Clearbrook, on my horse last fall. I rode through Wrenshall. I rode through Carlton County. I rode to Fond Du Lac Reserve. I rode my horse along the Alberta Clipper line. And I don't know if you guys know, I don't know the road numbers, but there's a road right here outside of Wrenshall where I saw exposed pipe. have a picture of one of my dear friends sitting on exposed pipe. Those valleys there. I'm concerned, I don't know what that is. But these are things that I'm bringing to your attention that you have exposed pipe in your back yard already.

Do what you do, keep doing what you do. Thank you very much for standing up and reiterating what we've heard. This isn't a new argument, but thank you, 'cause you've strengthened the arguments of all those that were stating things for the last week and a half and will continue until April 4th

1 and hopefully beyond that.

I do thank you guys for listening to us.

It hasn't been easy to be the brunt of our arguments for a week and a half, to be called names and all those things.

Janet. You've got to give her a round of applause, you know.

And all you guys. I really mean that. I really mean that. Thank you for putting up, especially with me, for a week and a half. I know I'm not easy. I thank you's all, I love you's all, and hopefully we can come to a conclusion that is the best for our generations to come. Miigwech.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you. Has the young gentleman reconsidered? Or is he sleeping? Well, I'm tired too.

I'd like to thank all of you for attending and taking time out of your schedule, it's been very helpful for us. So if you have any questions I'd encourage you to please contact me either by mail, by phone, by e-mail if you have any questions. And Casey Nelson, who I mentioned, her phone number is available out there. I have business cards out there, please feel free to contact us at your convenience and we'll provide

whatever assistance we can. Casey is right there. So travel safe and be well and no drinking and driving. Thank you. (Meeting concluded at 10:06 p.m.)